HISTORICAL EVIDENCE ON THE CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE QUMRAN SECT

by

Ilan Heinrich Eybers
Department of Religion
Duke University

Volume 1 of two volumes

HISTORICAL EVIDENCE ON THE CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE QUMRAN SECT

by

Ian Heinrich Eybers

Department of Religion

Duke University

Approved, January 14, 1966

Wm. F. Stinespring

William F. Stinespring, Supervisor

James L. Price, Jr.

Kenneth W Clark

John Knox

Robert S Rogers

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Religion in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of Duke University

1965

ABSTRACT

(Religion - Biblical Studies)

HISTORICAL EVIDENCE ON THE CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE QUMRAN SECT

by

Ian Heinrich Eybers

Department of Religion

Duke University

Date: January 14, 1966

Approved:

Wm. F. Stinespring
William F. Stinespring, Supervisor

Kenneth W Clark

Robert S Rogers

James L. Price, Jr.

An abstract of a dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Religion in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of Duke University

1965

Tr.R.
Ph.D.
E97H
1966

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this dissertation is mainly to use the new and relevant data from the manuscript discoveries at Qumran to supplement the existing evidence for both the general recognition of the Canon of the Old Testament as authoritative Scripture and the delimitation of its extent. For this purpose the available historical data from other sources are reviewed and then the new material from Qumran is discussed.

It is important to note that the manuscripts found in the caves at Qumran belonged to a Jewish Sect which severed its relations with the rest of Judaism no later than 130 B.C. This date is of primary importance, because after this a sect which so strictly separated itself from all who did not agree with it, would not have accepted new additions to its religious literature or Canon from extraneous sources. Whatever elements are common to this sect and the rest of Judaism, should therefore be regarded as being common elements before the year 130 B.C., even if direct evidence may only come from a later period.

Information from the Talmudim, IV Ezra and Flavius Josephus indicates that shortly before A.D.100 the books of the present Jewish

Canon were generally held to constitute the immutable revelation of God, which means that these scriptures were regarded as canonical.

The Septuagint in the form in which it has come to us via the early Church, does not represent a purely Jewish tradition, but it formed the basis of the scriptures that were generally regarded as canonical in the Church till the time of the Reformation. The New Testament clearly testifies to the use of the "Law" and the "Prophets" as authoritative Scriptures in the first-century Church. The Apocrypha of the Septuagint was not so used. The canonical position of the "Hagiographa" and some other books, including Enoch, is difficult to determine from New Testament evidence. There is, however, a reasonable possibility that the Canon which was generally recognized in the New Testament and contemporary Judaism was the present Hebrew Canon.

The books of the Maccabees and Ecclesiasticus justify the conclusion that by 200 B.C., or earlier, the Law and Prophets were regarded as authoritative, while some books like Psalms were similarly viewed. The argument is advanced that the Law was accepted as Canon by the Jews in the time of Ezra.

At Qumran the "Law" was often quoted as divinely given (and therefore) canonical Scripture. Individual books of the "Prophets" were certainly treated in the same way; and since the Dodekapropheton was already treated as one book and the historical "Prophets" formed a unity, the canonical status of all the "Prophets" at Qumran is certain.

The canonicity of the individual Hagiographa and other edifying books from Qumran can be indicated with varying degrees of certainty. The evidence proves that Psalms, Proverbs, Chronicles and probably Job, Daniel and Ezra-Nehemiah were treated as canonical at Qumran. The evidence is inconclusive for the "Megillot", Ecclesiasticus, Jubilees, Enoch, the "Book HHGY" and possibly some others. Yet practical implications must have led to a fairly clear concept of what was Holy Scripture for the Qumran Sect. Such books had to be studied, commented upon and treated with more circumspection than other books.

The evidence seems to indicate that the final "canonization" of the Hebrew Old Testament occurred about AD.100, but the "Law" had been generally accepted as authoritative since 440-400 B.C., the "Prophets" since 330-300 B.C. and nearly all of the Hagiographa since about 150 B.C. Common to the ancient Old Testament "Canons" are Tôrâ N^{e}bî'îm and K^{e}tûbîm, with some doubts concerning the M^{e}gillôt and with the possible inclusion of Ecclesiasticus and Enoch.

I hereby declare that this dissertation is entirely my own work in presentation and argumentation and with regard to the Qumran Manuscripts the investigation was, to my knowledge, quite original. Throughout the dissertation indebtedness to others has consistently been acknowledged in the notes. I also declare that neither this dissertation nor any part of it has ever been submitted to any other University for the attainment of a degree.

I. H. Eybers.

I.H. EYBERS.

PREFACE

Yet another survey of the data on the Canon of the Old Testament and yet another manuscript dealing with the data of the Qumran Manuscripts, especially from somebody who has not handled these Manuscripts, might seem somewhat presumptuous, but if an apology is necessary, let me offer it by saying that some of the writings dealing with the Qumran Manuscripts that have appeared hardly bear the marks of responsible scholarship. Moreover, while many scholars have devoted attention to the meaning of these Manuscripts for the New Testament and its Jewish background, fewer scholars have paid much attention to their value for the Old Testament, and nobody, to my knowledge, has given a systematic discussion of the importance of these discoveries for the Canon of the Old Testament. Yet it seems that new and relevant data may indeed be gathered in this connection. Hence this new treatment does seem justified. At this stage one clear example may suffice. Once upon a time it was possible to state that all Hebrew books antedating Christ were canonical; and although this statement was questioned[1] the clear proof of its inadequacy came with

---

1. See H.E. Ryle, The Canon of the Old Testament: An Essay on the Gradual Growth and Formation of the Hebrew Canon of Scripture (2d ed., London, 1895), pp.6-7.

the discovery at Qumran of numerous non-canonical Hebrew writings antedating Christ.

G. Ch. Aalders distinguishes five aspects in the investigation of the Canon:[1] (i) the collection of the books, (ii) the recognition of their authority, (iii) the arrangement of the various writings, (iv) the delimitation of the extent of the Canon,[2] and (v) the definition of the idea of the Canon. That such an investigation is necessary for the student of the Old Testament has been demonstrated by H.E. Ryle, even though he admits that there are many obscure points in the history of the formation of the Canon.[3] It is exactly in connection with some of these obscure points that the discoveries at Qumran supply additional information, and since my purpose will be mainly to place this new information in its historical context, this dissertation will deal primarily with the second, fourth and fifth aspects noted above. For the same reason, I shall concentrate more on the general period of the Qumran Community itself neglecting

---

1. See his Oud-Testamentische Kanoniek, (Kampen, 1952), p.28. (Hereafter cited as: Aalders, Kanoniek).

2. This should be distinguished from the preceding act of collecting the books; thus also A. Weiser, Einleitung in das Alte Testament (2d ed., Göttingen, 1949), p.252.

3. Ryle, pp.1-3.

to some extent the witnesses of the Old Testament on the one hand and the comments of Church and Synagogue in the Middle Ages and afterwards on the other.[1]

An undertaking such as this however could not have been attempted, had it not been for the invaluable work of many predecessors in this field, whose names appear in the Bibliography. Their work has been of great assistance in compiling information on the Canon from various ancient sources, and also in drawing attention to many references to the Old Testament in the texts of Qumran, as well as in other aspects of this study. A serious problem in this respect however, has been to keep abreast of literature which keeps on appearing at an amazing rate. Important publications may unfortunately have been overlooked.

Much gratitude is due to the supervisor of the study, Professor William F. Stinespring, who not only acted as a friendly guide and advisor when I had the opportunity of attending his classes, but also engaged in cordial correspondence even when I had to return to far-away South Africa. Grateful mention should also be made of Prof. Msgr. Patrick W. Skehan who acted as external reader of this dissertation and Prof. J. Strugnell for some valuable comments.

---

1. The same approach was followed by S.J. du Plessis, Jesus en die Kanon van die Ou Testament (Potchefstroom 1950), p.28.

I also wish to thank Prof. William H. Brownlee, formerly of Duke University, for the active way in which he too encouraged my interests in the Qumran Texts, which have also been one of his fields of special interest. I further gratefully wish to recall the time spent in learning from my other ex-teachers at Duke University, Kenneth W. Clark, James L. Price, Robert S. Rogers and H. Shelton Smith.

My happy association with these teachers would not have been possible if a fellowship had not been granted to me by the Duke University Chapel Fund and Duke University Graduate School. My sincere appreciation for this award should be specially noted.

In expressing my gratitude to former teachers, the names of various others should be mentioned. Among the many are E.P. Groenewald, J.H. Kritzinger and A. van Selms of the University of Pretoria and the late R.H. Pfeiffer of Harvard University. Many friends, librarians and typists have also contributed to this study by their encouragement and help.

A personal word of thanks to my mother who has not only shown a loving interest in all my labours but has also helped in many respects, as in the reading of this manuscript. To my wife the same thanks are due for her encouragement and patience during the many lonely hours she had to spend while this work was in progress both at Duke University and later.

Above all I thank God who enabled me to reach this goal, and I hope that even this study may contribute to the glorification of his Name.

I.H.E.

Pretoria
April, 1965

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT		iv
PREFACE		vii
I.	INTRODUCTION	2
II.	THE JEWISH CANON TOWARD THE END OF THE FIRST CENTURY A.D.	17
III.	DATA FROM THE SEPTUAGINT	48
IV.	DATA FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT	63
V.	DATA FROM THE PRE-CHRISTIAN PERIOD, EXCLUDING QUMRAN	98
VI.	THE "LAW" AND "PROPHETS" AT QUMRAN	124
VII.	OTHER SACRED BOOKS AT QUMRAN	160
VIII.	AUTHORITATIVE SCRIPTURE AND ITS USE AT QUMRAN	208
IX.	THE ORIGIN OF THE CANON	235
X.	CONCLUDING REMARKS	259
BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CITED		268
TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS		280
TRANSCRIPTION OF HEBREW CHARACTERS		282

HISTORICAL EVIDENCE ON THE CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE QUMRAN SECT

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

It is a well known fact that the word "canon" comes from the Greek word κανών (from κάννα) and was originally derived from the Hebrew קנה which primarily indicated a cane, a reed or a measuring rod (cf. Ezek. 40:3,5 in Hebrew). From this it acquired the meaning "measure", and then "norm, standard and rule" as in Gal. 6:16.[1] Among early Christian authors there are references to the "canon of truth" and "canon of faith", thus indicating that truth and faith which is proclaimed throughout the Church. This word was also used for ecclesiastical regulations, but in the fourth century the term "canon" or derivatives of it, gradually came to be applied to the Scriptures, and as a technical term for the "Scriptures inspired by

---

1. Other examples are in II Cor. 10:13-16 and the First Letter of Clement of Rome 1:3; 7:2; 41:1, cf. also the data in Aalders, Kanoniek, pp. 53-55, C.F. Keil, Handboek der Historisch-Kritische Inleiding in de Kanonieke en Apokryfe Boeken van het Oude Testament. Translated anew from the 3rd German edition by P.J. de Roode (Utrecht, 1879), pp. 657-58 and W.O.E. Oesterley and Theodore H. Robinson, An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament ("Living Age Book LA23" New York, 1958), p.1.

God" the word "canon" appears in the writings of Amphilochius of Iconium (about 380 A.D.). The word "canon" was henceforth used as a technical term for the Holy Scriptures, especially in the Latin-speaking Church. This use may be seen also in the terminology of the Council of Trent where the Bible is referred to as "libri sacri et canonici".

The term "canon" therefore denotes the <u>authoritative character</u> (for life and doctrine) of the Scriptures that have been accepted by the Church. Another meaning of "canon" which may be considered in this respect, is "list", a meaning found for example in the writings of Eusebius. Whether this meaning "list" also contributed to the use of the term "canon" for the Holy Scriptures by indicating those writings which were listed to be read in the Church is a moot question.[1] Yet it does seem that the meaning "authoritative", "normative" and "regulative" (cf. the Latin <u>regula</u>, which was often used to translate κανών) was the primary reason for designating the Holy Scriptures as "canonical" and later as "<u>the</u> canon", whereas the meaning "listed (to be read)" can at its most be of secondary importance.[2] We therefore subscribe to the opinion that the "books of scripture are canonical as

---

1. This derivation seems to have originated with Semler in his <u>Abhandlungen von freier Untersuchung des Kanons</u>, cf. G. Wildeboer, <u>Het Ontstaan van den Kanon des Ouden Verbonds historisch-kritisch Onderzoek</u> (3d ed., Groningen, 1900), p.87 and Aalders, <u>Kanoniek</u>, p.54 (with references to Eusebius and to Kittel's <u>Tehologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</u>). This opinion has been rejected by various scholars, cf. Keil, p.658.

2. Cf. Wildeboer, p.87 and G. Ch. Aalders, "De Canon van het Oude Testament", <u>Bijbelsch Handboek</u> (Kampen, 1935), 1, p.329 (hereafter cited as <u>Bijbelsch Handboek</u>.

being the authoritative standards of faith and practice".[1]

Although the actual term "canon" is found only in later Christian literature, the idea itself is older, both in the Church and in the Synagogue, and even the recognition of certain writings as canonical was preceded by their use in official and private worship or for devotional reading.[2] "Canonization" is therefore only the recognition of the canonical status which had already been accorded to the writings by usage,[3] and it may even be claimed that the Holy Scriptures were canonical from the outset, but that it took some time for them to prove themselves as such.[4] The very fact that these Scriptures have been accorded normative authority presupposes their divine

---

1. H. Wheeler Robinson, The Old Testament: Its Making and Meaning ("The London Theological Library"; London, 1937), p.184, cf. K. Dronkert, Gids voor het Oude Testament ("Boeket Reeks"; Leiden, 1964), I, p.110 and G.T. Manley (ed.), The New Bible Handbook (3d ed., London, 1950), p.26, (hereafter cited as New Bible Handbook). There is a different emphasis in D.R. Ap-Thomas, A Primer of Old Testament Text Criticism (London, 1947), p.1.

2. Thus e.g. Weiser, pp.251-52 and Wildeboer, p.155, cf. also Keil, p.655 and Ryle, pp.126-27. This devotional use was selective, and this selection is indicated by Ryle (pp.7, 14-17, 110) where he says: "the beginnings of the Hebrew Canon are not to be confounded with the beginnings of Hebrew Literature" (p.16), for the canon was formed when certain books "were separated from all other writings as the sacred and authoritative expression of the Word of God" (p.17).

3. Thus is possible an unofficial "canonization" (i.e. recognition) before the official decision of an authoritative body, as in the case of the New Testament, about which an authoritative body decided only in 397 (Council of Carthage), although a general consensus had been reached much earlier. (In this we agree with the term "canonization" as used by Wildeboer, p.118).

4. Cf. Aalders, Kanoniek, pp.28, 55, Keil, p.655 and New Bible Handbook, p.26 (where it is stated that the Scriptures are canonical "not because any body of men has made them so, but because they already bore the stamp of their divine origin, which was recognized as distinguishing them from all other books").

origin and therefore the idea of God's revelation in spoken and written words.[1] Many may also believe that this process of selection and recognition of certain writings took place under divine guidance.[2]

From what has been said, it is evident that we agree with H.H. Rowley's warning against any "simple and schematic theory of the establishment of the Canon of the Old Testament".[3] Rowley asserts that "canonicity grew imperceptibly" like a tree, which may at first be transplanted but later reaches a stage when it cannot be moved. It became progressively more difficult for new works to attain a place in the Canon, he says, "though we cannot define with precision the point when it became impossible" for books to be included, nor indicate when each of the accepted books "passed that indefinable point" where they were admitted into the Canon.[4] This tends to make a description of the history of the canonization a difficult

---

1. Compare O. Eissfeldt, Einleitung in das Alte Testament unter Einschluss der Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen sowie der apokryphen- und pseudepigraphenartigen Qumran - Schriften: Entstehungsgeschichte des Alten Testaments (3d ed., "Neue Theologische Grundrisse"; Tübingen, 1964), p.759 and Weiser, p.245.

2. So e.g. N.H. Ridderbos, "Canon of the Old Testament," The New Bible Dictionary (London, 1962), p.187, also Bijbelsch Handboek pp.329-30 and Ryle p.12. Wildeboer (pp.153-54), however, emphasizes more the human element.

3. The Growth of the Old Testament (London, 1950) p.173 (hereafter cited as Rowley, Growth of the O.T.)

4. Rowley, Growth of the O.T., p.173, cf. Weiser, p.249 with reference to the K^{e}tûbîm.

task; but, as against this, there are definite historical witnesses that testify to the situation at certain periods.[1] A careful evaluation of these will lead to conclusions as to the minimum of what was regarded as Holy Scriptures at a certain stage, or may indicate the latest period at which a certain stage had been reached. (It is quite possible that that stage was reached even earlier, but that definite evidence to prove it, is lacking).

It is clear that once certain books have been accorded such veneration that they are regarded as authoritative (word of God) and their text as unalterable, they may be called canonical. This also implies their separation from other books which are not regarded as holy, and the fixation of their number.[2]

There is hardly any doubt that the well known division of the Hebrew Canon into Tôrâ, N^{e}bî'îm and K^{e}tûbîm is significant in the history of the recognition of this Canon, and suggests that these divisions represent various stages in the process of "canonization".[3] The remainder of this investigation will bear out the validity of this supposition. Here it is unnecessary to discuss the variety of

---

1. Cf. Wildeboer's argument (p.iii) against Geiger, although he himself acknowledges the difficulties (p.118, cf. Dronkert, p.94).

2. These characteristics have already been indicated by Josephus (Contra Apionem i, 8), cf. Weiser, pp.241-42 and C. Kuhl, Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments ("Sammlung DALP, 26", München, 1953), pp.37-38.

3. The Jews ascribed the tripartite division to various degrees of inspiration, cf. Bijbelsch Handboek, p.340, Kuhl, p.34 and Ryle, p.132.

arrangements within these main divisions--a variety which may be seen especially in the different sequences of the books of the K^{e}tûbîm in various ancient traditions.[1] These differences should of course be attributed mainly to the fact that in the period before the book and codex became commonly used, the scrolls containing the separate books were not necessarily kept in a fixed sequence; only in the case of the historical books (Genesis-Exodus and Joshua - II Kings), do we find a definite principle of arrangement.

Since the Qumran Scrolls all belong to the period before the invention of the codex, and hardly any significant new data on the arrangement of Biblical books have been found at Qumran, this matter requires no separate treatment here.[2]

What should, however, be indicated at this stage, is the contribution which the discoveries at Qumran can make towards the discussion of the history of the Old Testament Canon.

For this purpose it is not necessary to review the history of

---

1. Reference can be made to the treatment by Ryle, pp.292-94 (Excursus C, where he also refers to Ginsburg's treatment of this subject) and pp.221-46. The differences between the Hebrew arrangement and the Septuagint are conveniently tabulated by Ap-Thomas, pp.3-4, where the differences in the group of (latter) prophets are also indicated (cf. further Eissfeldt, pp.771-72).

2. It should be noted, however, that there are indications of a fixed sequence of certain books at Qumran; in 4Q Test. Ex., Num., Deut. and Joshua are quoted in that order, and in 4Q manuscripts there are cases of continuity from Gen. to Ex. and Lev. to Num. (according to a communication by P. Skehan). There are also the references to the "Law of Moses" (indicating some unity, though in itself not proving a fixed sequence), and the indications that the "Twelve Prophets" were already grouped together, but the latter already occurs in Ecclus. 49:10(12).

the discovery of the Scrolls,[1] nor to deal with the various arguments for their antiquity and the authenticity of the discoveries.[2]

What is more relevant to the present study is to investigate the theory of H.E. del Medico that the manuscript-caves in the vicinity of Khirbet Qumran were g^{e}nîzôt where apocryphal and defective manuscripts were stored away about A.D.60 (at the command of Rabbi Simon ben Gamliel I) or between A.D.90 and 115 (at the command of Rabbi Gam-

---

1. Detailed accounts can be found in J.M. Allegro, The Dead Sea Scrolls ("Pelican Books, A376"; Harmondsworth, 1956), pp.15-40 (hereafter cited as Allegro, DSS). G. Lankester Harding, "The Discovery, the Excavation, Minor Finds", Qumran Cave I (edited by D. Barthélemy and J.T. Milik, "Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, I", Oxford, 1955) pp.5-7, F.M. Cross, The Ancient Library of Qumrân and Modern Biblical Studies ("The Haskell Lectures, 1956-1957", London, 1958) pp.1-23 (hereafter cited as Cross, Ancient Library), M. Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls with Translations by the Author (New York, 1955), pp.3-69 (hereafter cited as Burrows, DSS), and Y. Yadin, The Message of the Scrolls (London, 1957), pp.15-59 (hereafter cited as Yadin, Message of Scrolls).

2. The author has summarised some of these in his "Opmerkings oor die Qoemraan-dokumente (Dooie See-manuskripte) en die Bybel, veral ten opsigte van die Opsienersamp", Tydskrif vir Geesteswetenskappe, IV, 196-97, cf. also concerning the date of the pottery, R. de Vaux, "La Poterie", Qumran Cave I, pp.9-12 and R. de Vaux "Exploration de la region de Qumrân", Revue Biblique (hereafter RB), LX (1953), 541; concerning the date of the building (ca. 130 B.C. to A.D.70) see R. de Vaux, "Fouille au Khirbet Qumrân: Rapport préliminaire sur la deuxième campagne", RB, LXI (1954) 213, 234 (and p.212 on the inkwells), and "Fouilles de Khirbet Qumrân: Rapport préliminaire sur les 3e, 4e et 5e campagnes", RB, LXIII (1956), 536-38; concerning the radiocarbon dating of the linen coverings of the scrolls and the dating of the scrolls in general, see also W.S. La Sor, Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Faith (revised edition, Chicago, 1962), pp.31-33, K. Schubert, Die Gemeinde vom Toten Meer: Ihre Entstehung und ihre Lehren (Munchen, 1958), H. Bardtke, Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer (2d ed., Berlin, 1953), p. 167, H.H. Rowley, The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls (Oxford, 1952), p.54 (hereafter cited as ZF and DSS) and The Dead Sea Scrolls and Their Significance (London, 1955), pp.5-6. Opposing views are found especially in the articles of S. Zeitlin in the Jewish Quarterly Review and his The Dead Sea Scrolls and Modern Scholarship.

liel II).[1] If this were true, it would serve no purpose to try to determine what the character of the various writings was and what information may be gained about their canonical standing, for we would be dealing with writings which had been precisely rejected for the reason that they contradicted the current opinions about the Canon or because they were regarded as defective copies; and we would not know to which category each manuscript belonged. Moreover, if the later date were accepted, we would arrive at a date when, according to a general consensus among scholars, the Old Testament Canon was finally fixed[2]--and even the date A.D.60 would be so close to that of the closing of the Canon (A.D.90) that hardly any significant differences could be expected.

The views of Del Medico, however, are open to various objections.

---

1. H.E. Del Medico, Deux manuscrits hébreux de la Mer Morte (Paris, 1951), p.25; cf. p.24 where he argues that at the time of this Rabbi Simon caves were used as g^{e}nîzôt. Compare also the discussion by Burrows (DSS, pp.75-76, where he mentions the similar view of E.L. Sukenik. Sukenik's view, however, was that the cave had been a sectarian g^{e}nîzâ, but this view had been proposed before manuscripts were found in the other caves and before the building at Qumran was excavated) and M. Burrows, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls: New Scrolls and New Interpretations with Translations of Important Recent Discoveries (London, 1958), pp.16-19 (hereafter cited as Burrows, More Light). Del Medico also maintained in "L'état des manuscrits de Qumran I," Vetus Testamentum, VII (1957) (hereafter cited as VT) 127-28, that some of the manuscripts in cave 1Q were partially burned beforehand, but there is no evidence of burning on the manuscripts. The damage to the scrolls could just as easily have been caused by the decomposition of the leather and exposure to the elements and various types of vermin.

2. Compare e.g. R.H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament (revised edition, New York, 1948), pp.64-65, Allegro, DSS, p.51, J.T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, translated by J. Strugnell ("Studies in Biblical Theology, 26", London, 1959), pp.23, 29, 139 and our next chapter. Cf. Allegro, DSS, p.51.

One of these objections arises from the evident indications that the caves where the manuscripts were found were certainly related to the building of Khirbet Qumran, thus eliminating the possibility of their being Rabbinic g^{e}nîzôt. Proof of this relationship is provided by the jars in which the manuscripts had been stored in cave 1Q. These jars are of a type practically unknown elsewhere in Palestine, yet large quantities of similar jars were found when the building of Qumran was excavated, and the pottery where these jars were probably manufactured was also excavated inside the building complex.[1] The relationship has further been confirmed by the presence of two ink wells in the building which contained the same sort of ink as that with which the texts of the scrolls were written, possibly also by the presence of writing "desks" in the building, and also by the finding amongst the debris of the remains of a piece of pottery inscribed with the same type of lettering as the scrolls.[2] It should also be noted

---

1. R. de Vaux, "La Poterie" and "Exploration de la region de Qumran" as quoted in note 2 on p.8 and Burrows, More Light, p.19. Del Medico's counter-argument, that the scrolls were placed into the jars only inside the caves, is unacceptable because nobody would place scrolls which he had already tried to burn inside jars to preserve them.

2. Cf. R. de Vaux, "Fouille au Khirbet Qumrân: Rapport préliminaire sur la deuxième campagne", RB, LXI (1954), 212, 229. References to other authors who agree with these conclusions have been indicated in the present author's "Aspekte van die Organisasie en Rites van die Joodse Qoemraansekte" (D.D. dissertation, University of Pretoria, 1961), pp.146-48 (hereafter referred to as "AORQS"). A third ink well is mentioned by Burrows, DSS, p.66 and R.B.Y. Scott, Treasures from the Judean Caves: The Story of the Dead Sea Scrolls (Toronto, 1955) pp.18-19.

that the contents of some of the manuscripts--especially the Sectarian Manual of Discipline (1QS)--admirably suit the data from the excavations of the Qumran building: the pattern of communal life sketched in this document would fit well into the desert habitation.[1]

Of a less decisive nature is the fact that Del Medico's theory encounters some difficulty with the date assigned to the manuscripts on palaeographic grounds, quite apart from the excavations of the building. The dates originally assigned to the manuscripts by palaeographers agree remarkably with those of the occupation of the Qumran building, primarily based on numismatic data. The palaeographic dates, later corroborated by datable texts from Maṣṣada and Murabba'ât, are in many cases considerably higher than Del Medico's date for the rejection of the scrolls.[2] Of course the manuscripts would have been old when placed in a g^{e}nîzâ (as Del Medico supposes), but account should be taken of the fact that the Isaiah Scroll 1Q Is^{a} would have been no less than 160 years old and a Samuel text (4Q Sam b) from cave 4Q (also a g^{e}nîzâ?) a century older, when they were placed there. The questions which are most difficult to answer on the basis of Del

---

1. The quotation of Is. 40:3 in IQS viii 12-16 may also be considered in this context. Since the Qumran building was situated in "the Arabah", this word would be very applicable in 1QS viii 14, but cf. D. Barthélemy's argument that it looks more like b^{c}rkh, in "Notes en marge sur les manuscrits de Qumrân", RB, LIX, 198.

2. A lucid discussion of the value of palaeography for dating purposes may be found in Burrows, DSS, pp.83-101; for the dates assigned to some of the manuscripts (e.g. those mentioned here), see S.A. Birnbaum, "How old are the Cave Manuscripts? A Palaeographical Discussion", VT I (1951) 91-105, F.M. Cross, "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran", Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIV (1955), 164, F.M. Cross, Ancient Library, pp.121-22.

Medico's hypothesis are: if cave 1Q was a g^{e}nîzâ, why were some of the scrolls placed in jars, and were the other ten Qumran caves in which manuscripts were found, also g^{e}nîzôt?[1]

In spite of objections, it seems justifiable therefore to regard the manuscripts found in the caves near Khirbet Qumran as belonging to the Qumran Sect who inhabited the building in the period between about 130 B.C. and A.D.68.[2] This means that the evidence afforded by these manuscripts may be used in trying to establish the canonical position of the various writings according to the Qumran Sect, and that this cannot reflect a position later than A.D.68.

However, it is of fundamental importance for our discussion of the Canon to realize that the documents with which we are dealing belonged to a religious sect within Judaism. Objections might be raised to this term if we regard a "sect" as a group that deviates from the normative religion, for at this stage there was no "normative Judaism", since this came into existence only after A.D.70 when the

---

1. Del Medico's views are also discussed and rejected by M. Burrows, e.g. in his DSS, p. 76 and More Light, p.16.

2. For these dates cf. R. de Vaux in RB LXI and LXIII (as quoted in note 2 on p. 8) and his "Fouille au Khirbet Qumrân", RB, LX (1953), 104-05. Among others the clear summary in Cross, Ancient Library, pp.42-48 should be noted, cf. also C.T. Fritsch, The Qumran Community: Its History and Scrolls (New York, 1956) pp.16-20, Eissfeldt, pp.871-73, A.S. van der Woude, Die Messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde vom Qumran (Doctoral Dissertation, Assen, 1957, p.242 hereafter cited as V.d. Woude, Messianischen Vorstellungen) and "AORQS", pp.7-12, 37-38. An authority such as J.T. Milik (p.144) actually dates the settlement at Qumran c. 150 B.C., cf. his historical arguments for a date between 152 and 145 B.C. (pp.51, 84-85). Here we disagree with K.H. Rengstorf, Hirbet Qumrân and the Problem of the Library of the Dead Sea Caves (Leiden, 1963), p.21

Pharisaic views alone were accepted.[1] But the term "sect" may also be applied to a religious group that follows a certain leader and maintains an exclusive character, condemning all other religious groups that do not agree with it, and these characteristics are quite obvious in the Qumran Sect.[2] There are two major implications of this sectarian character of the Qumran texts for the study of the Canon.

One obvious point is that a religious sect is bound to have certain writings peculiar to themselves, which will be highly treasured and may even be elevated to canonical status.[3] Indeed many such writings have been found at Qumran, but because of the fragmentary nature of many of them, it is difficult to determine their exact

---

1. Cf. G.F. Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim (3 vols., Cambridge Mass., 1946), I, 86, and for the deliberate use of the term "sect" cf. K. Stendahl, The Scrolls and the New Testament (New York, 1957), p.7 (Stendahl's "Introduction and Perspective").

2. Compare Burrows, DSS, p.227 and J. van der Ploeg, Vondsten in de Woestijn van Juda: De Rollen der Dode Zee (3d. ed., "Prisma Boeken"; Utrecht-Antwerpen, 1959) (hereafter cited as v.d. Ploeg, Vondsten) pp.85-86 where he refers to J. Wach, Sociology of Religion, and goes on to call the community of Qumran "een typische secte". Their exclusive and condemning attitude is discussed in "AORQS", chapters IV and V.

3. A similar situation may be noted in the case of the Book of Mormon of the "Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints" or the use made of the writings of Mary Baker Eddy in Christian Science circles.

contents, let alone their status in the views of the Sect.[1]

Even more important for the history of the Canon is the fact that from the time when the Sect broke away from the rest of Judaism, there would have been a total separation in religious matters, including the Canon of acknowledged Scripture.[2] This means that from that stage onwards there would be no exchange of canonical writings between the Sect and the rest of Judaism, just as was probably the case with the Samaritans who acknowledged only the Tôrâ as Scripture.[3]

---

1. A survey of some of the texts found at Qumran was given in "Travail d'édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumrân. Avec des communications de M. Baillet, J.T. Milik, F.M. Cross, Jr., P. Skehan, J.M. Allegro, J. Strugnell, J. Starcky et C.-H. Hunzinger", RB, LXIII, 54-67, cf. also Cross, Ancient Library, pp.23-36 (especially 34-36) and Milik, chapter II, especially pp.37-43. It is not always clear which writings are of a specific "Qumranic" origin (cf. Cross, pp.34-35), although we have reason to regard 1QS (plus 1QSa, 1QSb), 1QM, 1QH as well as the pèšèr - commentaries, the Cairo Damascus Fragments (CD), the Book of Jubilees and possibly parts of Enoch and the Testament of Levi as such (cf. "AORQS" pp.906-930).

2. B.J. Roberts, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Old Testament Scriptures", Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XXXVI (1953), 86 (hereafter cited as Roberts, BJRL) is convinced that there was a fundamental difference between this sect and Rabbinic Judaism regarding the interpretation of Scripture and that this was the reason for their separation. Although disputes about the religious calendar and the legitimacy of the priesthood were probably the primary reasons for the schism, the view of Roberts confirms our opinion that these groups would hardly borrow one another's views on the Scriptures.

3. Cf. R.H. Pfeiffer, pp. 57, 110, who clearly states that "when the Samaritans seceded from Judaism the Pentateuch remained their Bible, to which nothing was added later", cf. Milik, pp.29-30. There are however some scholars who disagree, cf. our treatment in chapter V.

Common elements in the Canon of the Qumran Sect and the rest of Judaism must therefore be regarded as common property of Judaism in the period before the founding of the Sect. It is quite clear that writings and traditions which definitely came into existence after the schism were never accepted by the opposing group: writings such as the Sèrèk Hayyaḥad (1QS), the Milḥâmâ (1QM), the pèšèr - commentaries and the book of Jubilees were never accepted by normative Judaism, whereas the opinions of the schools of Shammai and Hillel or the statements of the ancients in Pirqê'Abôt never appear in the writings of Qumran. It is obvious, then, that the date of the schism between Qumran and the rest of Judaism is of primary importance to a study of the Canon.

This is not the place to give a survey of all the possible datings of this schism that have been proposed by scholars.[1] A date round about the year 100 B.C. in the reign of Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 B.C.), has received strong support,[2] and seemed quite acceptable until the archaeological data were combined with the forceful arguments

---

1. Cf. the lengthy discussion by Burrows in his More Light, pp.191-249, the earlier discussion by K. Elliger, Studien zum Habakuk - Kommentar vom Toten Meer ("Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, 15"; Tübingen, 1953) pp.226-74, and the lucid summary by G. Vermès, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English ("Pelican Books, A551",; Harmondsworth, (1962) pp.57-58 (hereafter cited as Vermès, DSS. in English).

2. Thus W.H. Brownlee in his various discussions (also orally) of the "Habakkuk - pèšèr", also F.F. Bruce, The Teacher of Righteousness in the Qumran Texts ("The Tyndale Lecture in Biblical Archaeology, 1956"; London, 1957) pp.21-25 (cf. also our note 3 on p.16, regarding Dupont-Sommer).

of G. Vermès, J.T. Milik and F.M. Cross (Jr.) to push the date of the schism back to about the years 150-140 B.C., or at the latest about 130 B.C.[1] It may be that the origins of the sect should even be dated during the Seleucid period in the first half of the second century B.C.[2] These dates now seem more acceptable than those of scholars who place the origin of the Sect early in the Roman period about 65-60 B.C. or even later.[3] A sufficiently conservative date for the origins of the Sect would be the probable date of the first settlement of Qumran, about 130 B.C. On the basis of this date a study of the history of the Old Testament Canon and the data of Qumran may now be undertaken.

---

1. Cross, Ancient Library, pp.80-119 and Milik, pp.44-98 (especially pp.80-87), cf. Eissfeldt, pp.871, 873 and Vermès, DSS in English, pp.57 and 63. It was G. Vermès who urged for this early date in some of his earliest studies. Cf. "AORQS, p.83.

2. A. Michel, Le Maître de Justice d'après les documents de la Mer Morte, la littérature apocryphe et rabbinique (Avignon, 1954), Rowley, ZF and DSS, chapter III and his Jewish Apocalyptic and the Dead Sea Scrolls ("The Ethel M. Wood Lecture delivered before the University of London on 12th March 1957"; London, 1957) pp.6 and 26 and G. Vermès, Les Manuscrits du Desert de Juda (2d ed.; Tournai, 1954) pp.75 and 79 and Vermès, DSS in English, pp.57-67.

3. A. Dupont-Sommer, Aperçus préliminaires sur les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte (Paris, 1950), p.35ff, dates the death of the founder of the sect in 65 B.C., and in his The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes: New Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls, translated from the French by R.D. Barnett (London, 1954) p.49 (note I) he says that the date of the beginning of the founder's ministry is unknown (although it would be possible to date it back to the last years of the second century B.C.) K. Elliger, pp.266-74 does not indicate the date of origin of the sect very clearly, but places it during the High Priesthood of Hyrcanus 76-40 B.C. Quite untenable on archaeological grounds is the hypothesis which places the origins of the sect at the beginning of the Christian Era, cf. C. Roth, The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls (Oxford, 1958) especially pp.24-27, 70.

Chapter II

THE JEWISH CANON TOWARDS THE END OF THE FIRST CENTURY A.D.

Scholars of various convictions share the opinion that the Canon of the Hebrew Scriptures was "fixed for all times" by the Council at Jamnia in about A.D.90, and that this Canon contained the very books which Christians call the "Old Testament" and the Jews T^{e}nak (Tôrâ, n^{e}bî'îm, k^{e}tûbîm).[1] Other scholars however, do not altogether

1. The words quoted and the data are from R.H. Pfeiffer, p.64, cf. pp.65-66 where he says that this limitation was "axiomatic in normative Judaism since at least A.D.100". Ryle, pp.183 and 191, agrees with these views, referring also to Mishnah Eduyoth V, 5; cf. also Eissfeldt, pp.769-70, who points out that at this stage it was necessary to define the extent of the Canon over against other traditions (e.g. New Testament and apocalypses); Weiser, pp.253-54, who adds that this also implied fixation of the text; Kuhl, p.37, New Bible Handbook, p.32, Oesterley-Robinson, p.7. The official character of this decision is questioned by L. Koole, Het Problem van de Canonisatie van het Oude Testament, Kampen, 1955.

agree, because they think that the Canon was established far earlier, though they admit that at Jamnia discussions were held concerning books like Ezekiel, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs and Esther.[1] A few scholars maintain that it is doubtful whether anything definite can be said about the Council of Jamnia and that we know of no binding decisions that were promulgated there,[2] and therefore they conclude that the definite point of formal canonization was only reached in the second century A.D.[3]

The later date assigned to the final acceptance of the Canon depends on discussions concerning certain Biblical books recorded in the Mishnah, Talmud and even in later Jewish authors. Thus there were a few controversial comments on the book of Jonah in very late sources; yet this could hardly mean that the canonical position of Jonah was questioned at this late stage.[4]

---

1. See e.g. Aalders, Kanoniek, p.48, who regards the debates as based upon a fixed canon (also Ridderbos, p.191 and Keil, p.659), but cf. the objection of Wildeboer, p.74.

2. Rowley, Growth of the O.T., p.170.

3. Wildeboer, p.72, places the final decision in A.D.200 (Mishnah) or a half-century earlier, whereas S. Zeitlin places the first acknowledgment of the Kᵉtûbîm in A.D.65 and the admission of Esther into the Canon "some time after the Hadrianic period" cf. his "An Historical Study of the Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures", Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research, 1931-32 (1932) (hereafter cited as Zeitlin), p.132; (on p.133 he even places it in the third century).

4. Cf. Wildeboer, pp.62-63, 70 and Ryle pp.205-206 where doubts about the Book of Proverbs are also discussed (cf. Wildeboer, pp.63-64).

More or less the same may be said of the book of Ezekiel, but because of the importance of the terminology employed, some attention should be paid to this case.[1] In the Talmud (Shabbath 13b) it is said that Hananiah ben Hezekiah prevented the book of Ezekiel from being "withdrawn" (ngnz from gnz) on the ground that it differed from the Tôrâ in the last eight chapters, and because of the difficult description in chapter one.[2] The moot question really regards the meaning of the verb gnz in this connection. It's meaning of "store away" some scholars have interpreted as meaning "hide", in the sense of removing or excluding from the Canon (cf. the Greek word apokruphein and our "apocrypha"). This however is not the meaning of the word in the Talmud, for according to Shabbath 90[a] and Megillah 26[b] scrolls of the Tôrâ that have been damaged by rats or by frequent use, should be "stored away". This certainly does not mean that they are to be excluded from the Canon, but that they should no longer be used.[3] Shabbath 115[a] states that the Holy Scriptures that have been translated should also be stored away, but that they should be saved in case

---

1. This matter has been completely discussed by Zeitlin, pp.122-28, from which article much of the following is drawn.

2. In the Talmud (Menachoth 45[a]) there is a tradition according to which when Elijah returns (cf. Mal. 3:23; in English Versions Mal. 4:5) he will explain the discrepancies between Ezekiel and the Pentateuch, but there is also an interesting story of how Hananiah ben Hezekiah (a contemporary of Jesus Christ) explained them (Shabbath 13[b] and Chagigah 13 a-b) cf. Ryle, pp.203-04 or Wildeboer, pp.68-69, 74, or Keil, p.661. The reason for Ezekiel's "withdrawal" adduced by Torrey (mentioned by Zeitlin, p.124) need not detain us here, since we are not discussing the authorship of Ezekiel, and the idea of a pseudo-Ezekiel is strange to the Talmud.

3. Cf. du Plessis, p.36.

of fire--even on the Sabbath (indicating their value and sacred character). On the other hand heretical books should be destroyed by fire (cf. Acts 19:19). This again demonstrates the difference between books that should be stored away in a g^{e}nîzâ and books that are rejected completely (the s^{e}farîm ḥiṣônîm). The word gnz in connection with Ezekiel should therefore be understood as "store away or withdraw from public reading". For the reasons mentioned,[1] there was an attempt to withdraw the book of Ezekiel from public reading, but not to exclude it from the Canon of Scripture.[2] Wildeboer disagrees with this, arguing that the reading of a book in the Synagogue implied that such a book was canonical, but he weakens his own argument by distinguishing between the s^{e}fārîm g^{e}nûzîm and s^{e}fārîm ḥiṣônîm without giving the basis of distinction.[3]

---

1. For another story from the Talmud (Chagigah 13^{a}) and its possible meaning see Zeitlin, pp.127-28.

2. See Du Plessis, pp.36-37 (where he refers also to Hänel) and Zeitlin, p.128, where he also says that it was never forbidden to read from Ezekiel--even the first chapter was read publicly--but the Rabbis preferred that it should be studied by mature scholars (cf. Jerome's version of this view, quoted by Wildeboer, pp.67-68).

3. Cf. Wildeboer, pp.70 and 86 for the first view and p.92 for his unmotivated distinction. For the rejection of the terms s^{e}fārîm g^{e}nûzîm see Zeitlin, p.155.

It seems justifiable to conclude, then, that the term "store away" (gnz) does not refer to the canonical status of a book,[1] and that there was never any serious attempt to eliminate the Book of Ezekiel from the Canon.[2]

The term gnz is also used of another book, Ecclesiastes (Qôhèlèt), where the Talmud (Shabbath 30^{a-b}) states that "the Wise Men" wanted to "store away" (gnz) this book because it was regarded as self-contradictory and unorthodox, but left it because the beginning and end (1:3 and 12:13-14) agree with the Tôrâ.[3] Though the whole discussion reflects some doubt concerning Ecclesiastes, it does imply that the book was already regarded as canonical. This may be seen not only from the term gnz, but also from the fact that it was

---

1. Similarly Aalders, Kanoniek, p.49, Keil 660-61 and Ridderbos p.191, cf. Moore I, pp.246-47. We would even hesitate to agree with Ryle (pp.198-99) that the s^{e}fārîm g^{e}nûzîm were books about which there was "doubt rather than final rejection" and that they were "disputed books" - cf. our previous note.

2. Cf. Zeitlin, p.128. Even Wildeboer, p.68, admits that the position of Ezekiel is different from Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs and Esther, and that it was regarded as "holy", even though the differences from the Tôrâ were noted (cf. p.69). One may also note that these discussions, though they appear in the Talmud, are dated before A.D.50 (Wildeboer, p.68) and therefore belong before the discussions concerning Ecclesiastes (Eccl.) and Song of Songs (Song), though these appear in the Mishnah.

3. Similar doubts were also mentioned in the Midrashim (Koheleth Rabbah i 3 and xi 9 Wayyiqra Rabbah, Sec.28) and in Aboth de - Rabbi Nathan, cf. A. Cohen, Everyman's Talmud (reset edition; London and New York, 1949) p.144, Ryle pp.206-208, Wildeboer, p.65, cf. Du Plessis, pp.31-32. and Del Medico, p.21.

"left" (not "included") when the difficulties had been explained away.[1]

Elsewhere the book Ecclesiastes is associated with Song of Songs in a discussion whether or not they "defile the hands". The text reads: "All Holy Scriptures defile the hands. Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes defile the hands. Rabbi Judah (Meir, ca.A.D.120) said: Song of Songs defiles the hands, but Ecclesiastes was disputed; Rabbi Jose (ca.A.D.120-135) said: Ecclesiastes does not defile the hands, but Song of Songs was disputed" (Mishnah, Yadaim III, 5).[2] From these words we may conclude that early in the second century there was no longer any doubt that Song of Songs defiled the hands, though there were reminiscences of a period when there were controversies about Song, even though this was denied by Rabbi Akiba.[3] At this stage, however, it seems that there were still disputes about Ecclesiastes. At any rate, in the further discussion it was said

---

1. The very fact that the contradictions had to be eliminated implies that the book was already canonical, otherwise this would have been unnecessary. Cf. also Keil, p.660.

2. Thus Zeitlin, p.130, note 44, although in the translation in the text he transposes the names of the Rabbis according to the Talmud (Megillah 7[a], cf. Zeitlin p.157 and Ryle, p.209). For the Mishnah and further discussion cf. Zeitlin, pp.130-31, Wildeboer pp.64-65, Keil, p.660 and Du Plessis, p.31. Zeitlin (p.131) refers these disputes to the time of Hillel and Shammai and therefore we also translate "was disputed", contra Cohen, p.143, Keil, p.660, H. Danby: The Mishnah translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes (London, 1933) p.781, Ryle, p.209, Wildeboer, p.64.

3. Rabbi Akiba, whose statement concerning Song is discussed below (note 3 on p.23) was a contemporary of Rabbi Jose.

that the School of Shammai rejected (literally "made easy") Ecclesiastes, whereas the School of Hillel accepted it (literally "made difficult").[1] Whatever the outcome of this debate was at that earlier stage, it is reported that "the seventy-two Elders" affirmed that when Rabbi Eleazar ben Azariah was made president at the Council of Jamnia it was determined that "Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes defile the hands".[2] The opinion later held by Rabbi Jose, quoted above, was therefore contrary to the decision of the Council of Jamnia.

Finally this Mishnah records that Rabbi Akiba denied that anybody had ever maintained that Song of Songs did not defile the hands; if there had been any argument, it concerned Ecclesiastes, he said.[3]

---

1. This agrees with Mishnah Eduyoth V, 3 (quoted by Ryle, p.207, cf. Zeitlin, p.157) that according to the School of Shammai "Koheleth defileth not the hands; the School of Hillel says, It defileth the hands". In the light of this, we cannot accept Zeitlin's assertion (p.131) that there is no positive statement among the early rabbis that Eccl. defiles the hands; moreover, the spirit of the discussion reflects the contrary opinion, which was also clearly expressed in the Mishnah (at a later date), cf. Yadaim III, 5, quoted by Zeitlin, p.157. I could not locate the statement Zeitlin (p.157) attributes to R. Jose that "Kohelet was rejected" after this dispute.

2. Mishnah Yadaim III, 5 (derived from two witnesses). Where we refer to Rabbi Jose in the next sentence (above), Zeitlin would change it to Rabbi Judah (cf. note 2 p.22).

3. Cf. Zeitlin, p.157, whose paraphrase agrees with the translations of Keil (p.660) and Wildeboer (p.64), though differs slightly from Ryle's (p.210). Akiba said: "The whole world is not equal to the day when Song of Songs was given to Israel, for all the Kᵉtûbîm (or Scriptures) are holy, but Song of Songs is holiest of the holy (or most holy)".

It seems fairly certain from this Mishnah that at the Council of Jamnia there was a final decision that Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes "defile the hands" and that this virtually put an end to the former disputes about Ecclesiastes, and possible earlier disputes about Song of Songs.[1]

It now remains to determine the meaning of the expression "defile the hands" in this context. The Mishnah quoted above, reads: "All Holy Scriptures defile the hands".[2] This is a strange expression and calls for some comment. Various reasons were adduced to motivate such a decision. One reason advanced--which would hardly have been the original motive since scrolls were precious--was to prevent people from using scrolls of the Scriptures to cover the backs of animals when they rode them.[3] It is more likely that this was a measure to prevent the scrolls of Scripture, or the hands that touched

---

1. Probably there had been some doubt about both these books, for this is clearly admitted in the case of Eccl., and Akiba's "encomium" would hardly have been necessary if Song had not also been disputed (cf. Ryle, p.210 and Wildeboer, p.65, who refers to Talmud Megilla 7^a where Simon ben Menashah's dictum occurs that Song was given by the Holy Spirit, but Eccl. was the product of Solomon's own wisdom). The doubts about Song seem to have been removed by interpreting it allegorically. Later Eccl. was definitely used as canonical in Talmud Baba Batra 25^b etc. - cf. Du Plessis, p.34.

2. Mishnah Yadaim III, 5; as a statement of the Pharisees it also occurs without the word "all" in Yadaim IV, 6.

3. Tosefta Yadaim XI, 19 referred to by Du Plessis, p.33, where he mentions a number of these reasons.

them, from coming into contact with the T^erûmâ ("contributions" brought to the Temple--in this case grain produce). Some have said this would prevent mice that came after the grain from gnawing at the "holy" scrolls,[1] but others argue that this was the Pharisees' method of making the priests pay less attention to the written Law and more to the oral Law.[2] The real reason however, may simply have been to preserve the Holy Scriptures from careless and unnecessary handling.[3] It is a well-known phenomenon that sacred objects are regarded as taboo, and according to Jewish concepts contact with sacred objects required the washing of the hands.[4]

It seems, therefore, that because certain Scriptures were regarded as holy, they were thought to defile the hands. A fairly common opinion is that the expression "defiling the hands" as applied to Scriptures coincides with the Christian concept of "included in the Canon".[5] There have, however, been objections to this explanation

---

1. Talmud Shabbath 14^a, cf. Wildeboer, p.89 and Danby, p.626 (note 4).

2. Zeitlin, p.139.

3. Ryle, p.197 and Wildeboer, p.90.

4. Zeitlin, pp.139-40, mentions other sacred objects not to be used which also defiled the hands according to Jewish concepts, cf. Du Plessis, pp.33-34 who refers to the expression in the Talmud Yadaim 130^b: "Depending on the value of any object, is its capacity to contaminate;" further Oesterley-Robinson, p.4, and Weiser, p.252.

5. This view is held, amongst others, by Danby, p.431 (note 12), Eissfeldt, p.758, Oesterley-Robinson, p.4, Ryle, p.197, E. Sellin, Einleitung in das Alte Testament (9th ed. by L. Rost; Heidelberg, 1959) p.177 (hereafter cited as Sellin-Rost), Weiser, p.252, Wildeboer, p.88 (contra Bloch) and Zeitlin, p.141. Among those who do not agree, are Aalders, Bijbelsch Handboek, p.336 (who says the meaning of the expression is uncertain), Du Plessis, p.34, and Keil, p.660 (cf. M. Haran in Tarbis, referred to by Ridderbos, p.191).

on the following basis: Mishnah Yadaim IV, 6 reports that the Sadducees reproached the Pharisees for declaring that the Holy Scriptures defiled the hands but that the profane books (or the books of Homer) did not defile the hands. From this the conclusion is drawn that this expression does not refer to the Canon, for the Sadducees would not have required the profane books to be included in the Canon, nor did they ever regard these books as higher than the canonical writings.[1] These statements concerning the Sadducean attitude are, of course, correct, but these were not the points of the debate. The Sadducees did not acknowledge that the Holy Scriptures could defile the hands, and desiring to convince the Pharisees of the same ~~fact~~ view, they pointed to instances where the Pharisees admitted that books did not always defile the hands. Therefore it is wrong to conclude that the Sadducees would have desired the canonization of other books if "defiling the hands" meant "canonization"; the Sadducees did not want to include new books under those "defiling the hands", they wanted the Holy Scriptures to be excluded. And the statement that books not "defiling the hands" are estimated more highly than those "defiling the hands" proves lack of understanding of the taboo-character of holy objects. The very next sentence in the Mishnah text clearly indicates that the Pharisees declared that an object defiles the hands when they regarded it with special reverence, for there the dictum of the Pharisees is quoted: "The bones of an ass are clean, and the bones of Johanan the

---

1. So Aalders, Kanoniek, p.49 (where he states correctly that it is immaterial to the argument whether we read "profane book" or "books of Homer") and Du Plessis, p.34.

High Priest are unclean", followed by their motivation "As our love for them so is their uncleanness..... Even so the Holy Scriptures: as our love for them so is their uncleanness; (whereas) the writings of Hamiram which are held in no account do not render the hands unclean".[1]

Another alleged proof that "defiling the hands" is not synonymous with "canonical", is that Mishnah Kelim XV, 6 states that "all the (Sacred) Books defile the hands except the Book of the Azarah" (the copy of the Torah kept in the Court of the Temple). Here, it is argued, is a clear example of a canonical writing that does not defile the hands. Indeed, but it is also clearly stated that it is the one exception--which proves the rule! The reason for the exception is clear too: some things which were used in the Temple did not defile other objects, as they would have done, had they been used outside the Temple; indeed Rabbi Akiba in the Talmud (Pesah 19[a]) states: "There is no defilement of the hands in the Temple". Moreover, according to Mishnah Yoma VII, 1 the High Priest had to read from the Tôrâ on the Day of Atonement, and on that day he could not afford to be defiled at all (not even his hands).[2] The Scroll from which he had to read, therefore had to be an exception to the rule that "all Holy Scriptures defile the hands".

---

1. Translation of Danby, p.784, cf. Cohen, p.143 (note 4).

2. Cf. Zeitlin, p.140 (where he emphasizes that it was only this single Tôrâ-Scroll that formed the exception), contra e.g. Aalders, Kanoniek, p.49 and Du Plessis, p.34.

The third argument in this connection is the statement in Mishnah Yadaim IV, 5 that the Aramaic portions of Daniel and Ezra do not defile the hands when they are translated into Hebrew and similarly the Hebrew scriptures do not defile the hands when they have been translated into Aramaic.[1] But what would be wrong if the Jews denied the same measure of sanctity and authority to translations of their Scriptures, especially if these translations were free renderings like the Targumim? As a matter of fact, the Jews never regarded the Targumim as canonical. We may have become accustomed to the idea of regarding translations of the Bible as canonical, but we have no right to demand that the Jews in the time of the Mishnah (which was still written in Hebrew), should share such views.

We are apparently quite justified therefore in regarding the term "defiling the hands" as equivalent to our term "canonical". There would be a parallel between the two terms in the fact that the number of the writings belonging to such a group had to be determined precisely.[2] For that reason it was explicitly stated that books,

---

1. Aalders, Kanoniek, p.49, cf. the translation and notes of Danby p.784.

2. It was obviously necessary for the Jews to be certain as to whether their hands might be defiled by a certain book or not, cf. Ryle, p.197 and Weiser, p.252. (For the number cf. references in Cohen, pp.141 and 145).

like that of Ben-Sira (which came to the verge of being included in the Canon but was not included[1]) do not defile the hands, because Ben-Sira's book and others written after the Persian period were, according to Rabbinic opinion, written after prophecy had ceased.[2] The opposite of books "defiling the hands" is, therefore, the forbidden s^{e}fārîm hîṣônîm, since these two categories are mutually exclusive. The obvious conclusion is that here we have the difference between canonical and non-canonical writings.[3]

Thus far little difficulty has been encountered in regarding the Scriptures that defile the hands as canonical and the others as non-canonical; for even the case of Ecclesiastes was finally settled at the Council of Jamnia and thereafter the dissentient voices were but few. But concerning the Book of Esther we read in the Talmud that

---

1. R.H. Pfeiffer (pp.63 and 65 and 66) and Ryle (pp.194-95) recall that Ben-Sira is quoted as canonical three times in the Talmud (Berakoth 48^{a}, Erubim 45^{a} or 65^{a}, Baba Qamma 92^{b}); and Ryle, pp.197 and 199 (cf. Aalders, Kanoniek, p.50) says that these quotations were indicated as coming from Scripture "by mistake", for the book was definitely numbered under the s^{e}fārîm hîṣônîm which were forbidden to be read (in the Synagogue), according to Rabbi Joseph in the Talmud Sanhedrin, 100^{a} and according to Rabbi Akiba in the Jerusalem Talmud (Sanhedrin X, 28^{a}, cf. the Midrash Qohelet Rabba, 84^{a}, and also Jerome's statements in Wildeboer, pp.82 and 98-99).

2. Tosefta Yadaim III, 13, cf. Zeitlin, pp.141 and 145. This argument cannot be refuted by the three quotations (which may be from memory) (cf. note 1) cited by Wildeboer, p.99. Cf. also Bardtke, pp.13-14.

3. This is more or less admitted by Du Plessis, p.35, who feels compelled to declare that "defiling the hands" (wrongly called "die hande nie verontreinig nie") can only be applied to canonical writings. However, in view of the whole argument, it may also be said that it is applied to all canonical writings.

"Esther does not defile the hands" (Megilla, 7[a]), and this statement was made in the third century A.D.![1] Yet it should be noted that this does not represent the consensus of Rabbinic opinion, for it is clearly given as the opinion of one Rabbi, Samuel. It is also evident that the Talmud experiences some difficulty with this statement, for it goes on to ask whether this means that this Samuel regarded Esther as not having been "spoken by the Holy Spirit"?[2] It then ascribes to Samuel the statement that Esther was spoken by the Holy Spirit, but in order that it (Esther) should be read, but not written. This presents a new problem, for how can a book be read if it is not written? The best solution seems to be to restrict the meaning of "written" to the idea of "published in writing". Then this statement meant that Esther should not be made available to anybody, but should merely be read in the schools or in the Synagogue during the Purim festival.

---

1. Cf. Zeitlin, pp.132-33, Ryle, p.211 and Wildeboer, pp.66-67 (contra Bloch). Some of the following arguments are also derived from these sources. This statement of Samuel reminds one of some of Luther's statements like: "Ich bin dem Buche Esther so feind, dass ich wollte, sie wäre gar nicht vorhanden...." (Tischreden, ed. by Walch, XXII, 2080) and "Liber Esther, quamvis hunc habeant in canone, dignior omnibus, me iudice, qui extra canonem haberetur" (De servo arbitrio, ed. by Walch, VII, 194). Yet Luther retained this book in the Canon when he excluded the Apocrypha in his own German edition of the Bible (1534) (cf. Tischreden, LXII, 130ff.).

2. There are of course other ways of translating רוח הקודש נאמרה. Ryle (p.211, cf. Zeitlin, p.133 and Wildeboer, p.66) uses the term "inspired", but the phrase could literally be translated "spoken in the holy spirit". Wildeboer (p.66) doubts whether the following statement found in the Talmud was ever made by Samuel. The matter is also dealt with in Moore, I, p.238.

It is quite possible that the inclusion of the Book of Esther in the Canon was related to its being read during the Purim festival.[1] S. Zeitlin argues that because the Purim festival is included in "Megillat Ta^{c}anit" and the observance of Purim in the first century is not derived from Scripture, "the Book of Esther was not included among the Scriptures which were canonized in the year sixty-five". Only later, in the Talmud (Megilla 5^{b}) is the festival derived from the Book of Esther itself. At its best this remains an argumentum e silentio, which is always a precarious basis for a conclusion.[2] Hardly anyone denies that the holiday of Purim was already celebrated in the time of the Maccabees,[3] and that the Book of Esther was recited on that day. Thus it ranked high in public opinion and gained a place among the canonical books. To decide that the recognition of its canonical status occurred at a late stage because of the individual opinion of Samuel mentioned above, is not a well-founded argument.

---

1. Cf. Zeitlin, p.133, though it is doubtful whether the scholars were quite as reluctant to accept Esther as Zeitlin implies; in the Mishnah (eg. Yadaim III, 5) there are no signs even of a debate about Esther, though this book was certainly known at that stage otherwise it would not have found a place in the Christian Bible. (For Zeitlin's argument, above, cf. his p.132).

2. We may perhaps recall the gross errors to which Zeitlin's arguments (many of them also e silentio) lead him in connection with the dating of the Qumran manuscripts, cf. note 2 on p.8

3. Zeitlin, p.133 (note 50), demonstrates that doubts as to this fact are erroneous.

To cite in support of this fact that Melito of Sardis (ca. A.D.170) omits Esther from his list of canonical writings, is hardly impressive, for although Melito claimed to have made "accurate inquiry" in Syria, his list was not faultless.[1] In the first place, his sequence agrees with neither the Hebrew nor the Greek form of Alexandria (since he even places Numbers before Leviticus), and in the second, he includes one of the Apocrypha, the book "Wisdom of Solomon" (Sophia), between Proverbs and Ecclesiastes. The omission of Esther may have been a scribal error, "Esther" being confused with "Esdras" which probably preceded it, as in many ancient lists.[2] In Origen's list of books, also quoted by Eusebius, the Book of the Dodekapropheton is omitted, yet nobody would assume that this was anything but an error. The omission may perhaps have been intentional, for Esther was also omitted in some other early Christian lists and was deliberately left out by Athanasius in his "Festal Epistle XXXIX" (A.D.367), but it is quite probable that all these later lists were based on Melito's list (quoted by Eusebius).[3] If the omission was intentional, it may have been due to Christian prejudice, but also possibly to Jewish doubts,

---

1. The text according to Eusebius is to be found in Keil, pp.668 ff, Ryle, p.298, cf. Wildeboer, pp.76-77 (with note), and the discussion by Ryle, pp.214-17. Cf. H.B. Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (revised by R.R. Ottley, Cambridge, 1914) p.221.

2. Cf. Ryle, p.210. A less probable reason is that the informant of Melito rejected "Esther" because the copy he had in hand (or in mind) contained the Septuagint-additions. This could easily have been rectified (cf. Wildeboer, p.77, Keil, p.669).

3. Cf. Ryle, pp.215-18 and Keil, pp.661-62.

for the fast prescribed in Esther 9:31 on the thirteenth of Adar was not observed everywhere, having become a day of rejoicing after the triumph of Judas the Maccabee on this date (I Macc.7:48, II Macc. 15:36).[1] However, our final verdict in this matter would be to place little weight on the reports of the Church Fathers regarding the Jewish Canon.[2]

Probably there had been some opposition to the inclusion of Esther among the canonical books of the Jews, and possibly one of the reasons was that the Divine Name does not occur in the Book. This is indicated by the fact that the Talmud (Megillah 7[a]) contains a story that the Book of Esther requested (sic) the Wise men to be included in "the Book" (the Canon?), and that several Rabbis adduced arguments to prove that Esther was of divine origin. Finally the Wise Men were enlightened by God to include the book.[3] This final and formal acceptance may have been later than the public acceptance

---

1. Ryle, pp.216-17 and Wildeboer, p.77. This might have caused Esther to be regarded as one of the g^{e}nûzîm but not ḥîsônîm, a distinction which Melito and other Christian authors would not have understood, according to Ryle.

2. Similarly Zeitlin, p.134, note 53. That they followed the Septuagint in many ways, is obvious to anybody who studies their lists (eg. Keil, pp.670-72) in which they frequently combine Ruth with Judges and Lamentations and Baruch with Jeremiah. Cf. Swete, pp.222-23.

3. Cf. the Gemara of the Jerusalem Talmud on Megilla 1, 4, cited by Wildeboer, p.67, where he also refers to another story in the Talmud, Sanhedrin 100[a]; also Ryle, pp.210-11. The fact that some Rabbis regarded Esther more highly than the Tôrâ and Prophets (Keil, p.661 and Wildeboer p.74) also points to the fact that there had been uncertainty about its position.

at the Purim festival, but in the preceding discussion we found no reason to date this acceptance as late as Zeitlin (for example) does.[1] In view of the evidence from Josephus and IV Ezra (still to be discussed) we could date this acceptance before the end of the first Christian century.

Reviewing all the Rabbinic discussions touched upon, it is clear that in their deliberations there is never a shadow of doubt about the canonical position of the Tôrâ. It was given the place of honour in the Synagogue, and is regarded as the revelation par excellence, the written Law, in contrast to the works of the prophets (in the wider meaning of the term), which were regarded as traditions and explanations of the Tôrâ, or sometimes as parts of the "oral Law". In later Jewish tradition the Tôrâ was compared to the Most Holy Place in the Temple, the N^{e}bî'îm to the Holy Place and the K^{e}tûbîm to the Courtyard.[2] The N^{e}bî'îm were also regarded and treated as authoritative and canonical Scriptures, with some discussion only about the practical use of Ezekiel. The most important disputes and doubt were those

---

1. Zeitlin, p.134, places its inclusion at the time of the Academy of Oushah (cf. p.134). We could perhaps agree to placing it after A.D.65 on the basis of his arguments on p.132, though even here Zeitlin may be arguing too much from omission than from positive statements.

2. Cf. Wildeboer, pp.96-97, Sellin-Rost, p.181; note also how books like Ezekiel, Ecclesiastes and Esther had to be brought into conformity with the Tôrâ before they were generally accepted in the Canon (Cohen, pp.144-45, Ryle, pp.204, 208 and Wildeboer, pp.67 and 68). A statement from the ninth century, however, includes the "Prophets" and "Writings" under the Tôrâ which the Lord gave to Israel (cf. Wildeboer p.159).

about some of the Kᵉtûbîm, but even the last of these to have found general acceptance (Song of Songs), Ecclesiastes and Esther, were regarded as part of the Canon,[1] and were included in the twenty-four books that by A.D.90-100 were generally considered as forming the Canon.[2] According to the Jerusalem Talmud one of these disputed books, Ecclesiastes, was already quoted as Scripture as early as the time of Alexander Jannaeus (105-79 B.C.). Moreover, the Purim Festival, based on Esther, was already celebrated in the time of the Maccabees (as "Festival of Mordecai").[3] We have already noted that the Council of Jamnia reached a formal decision that Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes were to be included among the canonical Scriptures.

Writing on the discussions about some of these Scriptures in the Mishnah and later Jewish writings, H.E. Ryle aptly remarks: "Perhaps the most important thing for us to observe is that the discussions

---

1. Ryle (pp.248-49) shows from the Talmud, Shabbath 116ᵇ and elsewhere that the Kᵉtûbîm were also read in the Synagogue.

2. Cf. R.H. Pfeiffer, pp.64-66, though on p.65 he says that in some circles this canonization was not regarded as very stringent (cf. Du Plessis, p.32). There is but little evidence in support of the latter statement. Cf. also Weiser, p.253.

3. Cf. Ryle pp.148-49, Zeitlin, p.133, and Wildeboer, pp.74-75. If Wildeboer is correct in that the apocryphal book Wisdom of Solomon (2:1-9) (dated in the last century B.C. by Weiser, p.299 and by Eissfeldt, p.815) contains polemics against Ecclesiastes, it proves that even at that stage Eccl. was regarded as a very important book, even in Egypt; and this may have been one of the last attempts to try and avert its acceptance.

of the Jewish doctors, whether serious controversies or only academic displays of verbal adroitness, presuppose the existing canonicity of the disputed books".[1] All that remains to do is to mention in conclusion the opinion of a scholar as O. Eissfeldt, who maintains that what happened at Jamnia was a legitimization and supporting by dogmatic foundations of the Canon that already existed.[2]

******

1. The Canon of the Old Testament (already cited), p.213. R.H. Pfeiffer (p.66) is in complete agreement with this, calling these discussions "purely academic", cf. Keil (p.521) who regards the disputes as a means of justifying the inclusion of these books and as a means of opposing any others (cf. also Aalders, Bijbelsch Handboek, p.336, his Kanoniek, p.49 and Ridderbos, p.191). A different view is held by Wildeboer, who says these discussions were too vehement to be merely academic (p.74 contra Strack), and therefore the formal canonization only took place about A.D.150(p.145), although he regards this as a confirmation of a general opinion that had been formed about A.D. 100 (p.146). Though Du Plessis (p.33) agrees that the emotional character of the discussions eliminates the possibility of their being intended merely as displays of intelligence, he italicizes the statement that "the discussions were not so much concerned with the admission of the books into the Canon, as with their right to remain in the Canon" (original Afrikaans on p.89, where he quotes A. Bentzen, who agrees with this view).

2. Eissfeldt, pp.769-70, cf. H.W. Robinson, p.202. (Eissfeldt dates the Council of Jamnia in A.D.70-135).

Turning our attention to other Jewish writings dated in the latter half of the first century A.D., we note that Titus Flavius Josephus, writing his Antiquitates Iudaicae, used the Old Testament as one of his most important sources, but in the Greek version ("Septuagint") since he was writing in Greek. He uses books like Daniel and Esther, but also the "apocryphal" additions to these books as well as the "apocryphal"I Maccabees. Since he was writing a historical narrative, he did not limit himself to canonical writings, but also used sources from the times of the Caesars Augustus and Tiberius. Therefore it should not be taken as precise historical statements when he says that the "sacred books" of the Jews contain the history of five thousand years or that these books describe Jewish history to the twelfth year of Nero.[1]

His description of the Sacred Scriptures of the Jews, is to be found in one of his other writings, usually known as the Dialogue Contra Apionem, 1:8.[2] Because of its relevance we may quote rather

---

1. Cf. Ryle, pp.169-71 and Wildeboer, p.43. In view of his other statements we would be careful of concluding with R.H. Pfeiffer (pp.67-68) that Josephus regarded the apocryphal material "as equally authentic with the canonical books" (our italics).

2. For the Greek text (also indicated as 1:38-41) see Benedictus Niese, Flavii Iosephi Opera, Vol. V, Berlin, 1898, pp.8-9 (also Ryle, p.297 and Wildeboer, p.43). The translation of the text is that of the present author.

extensively from it:

> For we have not myriads of books, disagreeing from and conflicting with one another; but only twenty-two books, containing the record of all time past, which are justly believed in (added later: as divine). And of these, five are those of Moses, which contain the laws and the tradition concerning the origin of man down to the time of his (Moses') death--this period is just short of three thousand years. From the death of Moses to the reign of Artaxerxes,[1] king of the Persians after Xerxes, the prophets who came after Moses wrote down the events of their own times in thirteen books. The remaining four (books) contain hymns to God and practical precepts for men. But from Artaxerxes to our own time everything has indeed been written, but is not esteemed worthy of the same credit with those that preceded them, because of the absence of the exact succession of the prophets.[2] There is practical evidence of how we have given credit to these books of ours; for although so many ages have passed by, nobody has ventured either to add anything to or to remove anything from them, or to make an alteration (in them); but it has become natural for all Jews, from their very birth to regard these (books) as teachings of God (or: divine doctrines), to abide by them and, if necessary, to die for them.

The concluding lines make it clear that Josephus believed the Scriptures of the Jews to be of divine origin, the Jews abiding by them; and at the beginning he states that they were justly believed in.[3] These are expressions that indicate what we would call canonicity. The standard he applied to determine this canonicity was, to our minds, a rather crude one: the supposed time of composition.

---

1. Cf. further the notes of Ryle, p.172 and Keil, p.514.

2. Cf. the note of Ryle, p.173 and for the following the text of Wildeboer, p.44.

3. Cf. Aalders, Kanoniek, pp.41-42, Oesterley-Robinson, p.3 and Ryle, p.174. In the preceding discussion frequent reference was made to Ryle, pp.173-77.

The period of inspiration, according to the popular theory which Josephus was probably quoting, started with Moses and lasted till the time of "Artaxerxes", which is the name that Josephus gave to Ahasuerus (actually Xerxes) of the book of Esther.[1] It is clear from this that Josephus regarded the Canon as starting with the Books of Moses and ending in the time of Esther.[2] When, in about A.D.90, he wrote these words, Josephus regarded the Canon of Scripture as closed.[3] But that is not all: Josephus was not expressing a personal opinion here, he claimed to be stating what had "become natural for all Jews", the established opinion of his people (in contrast to the contradictory statements of Greek historians).[4] He even claimed that the text had been transmitted as inviolable for "many ages", and that during

---

1. Cf. Ryle, pp.172 and 175, where he refers to Josephus' Antiquitates xi, 6 and to xi 5, where Artaxerxes (cf. Ezra 7:1 and Neh. 2:1) is called Xerxes by Josephus. Cf. the similar conclusions of Oesterley-Robinson, p.3, R.H. Pfeiffer, p.63, Sellin-Rost, p.176, and Wildeboer, pp.45-46. and Moore, I, p.238; cf. Bardtke, p.14.

2. Probably the Canon was closed when the Book of Esther was admitted, according to Ryle, p.150. Eissfeldt (p.763) seems to take the "Artaxerxes" literally, and for this reason says that the Canon is supposed to be closed in the time of Ezra, just as in Baba Bathra 14^{b}-15^{a}. In support of the latter view reference may be made to the various traditions about Ezra's rôle in the formation of the Canon.

3. Cf. R.H. Pfeiffer, p.63, also Sellin-Rost, p.176 and Wildeboer, p.46, who date the book about a decade later.

4. Cf. S.R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament ("Meridian Library, ML3", New York, 1956). p.X, Ryle, p.173, also Aalders, Kanoniek, p.34, and Bijbelsch Handboek, p.336.

all this time no additions or omissions had been made. This reflects the reaching of a consensus of opinion before the formal decision by any official body.[1]

As we should expect from such a Canon of Scripture, its number of books is definite. Josephus sets it at twenty-two.[2] The five books he ascribes to Moses, are clearly the first five books in all Bibles, the Pentateuch. From Moses to Esther he counts thirteen historical books. In this topical arrangement, as throughout his writings, he was certainly influenced by the Greek Septuagint. These books, then, would be (1) Joshua, (2) Judges and Ruth, (3) Samuel, (4) Kings, (5) Chronicles, (6) Ezra and Nehemiah, (7) Esther, (8) Job, (9) Daniel (10) Isaiah, (11) Jeremiah with Lamentations, (12) Ezekiel, (13) The Book of the Twelve Prophets. The four remaining books would be the "hymns" of Psalms and Song of Songs and the "practical precepts" of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes.[3] There have been some objections to this arrangement, however, since the Jewish tradition affirms that the

---

1. Similarly Wildeboer p.46 (cf. p.45 and New Bible Handbook, p.32).

2. For this and the following discussion, special reference was made to Eissfeldt, pp.770-71, R.H. Pfeiffer, p.64, Ryle, pp.125, 174-77 and 230-33, H.W. Robinson, pp.187 and 201-02, Weiser, p.253 and Wildeboer, pp.44-45, cf. Aalders, Kanoniek, pp.34 and 48, Ap-Thomas, p.6, Keil, p.524, Kuhl, p.22, New Bible Handbook, p.31, Oesterley-Robinson, p.5, Ridderbos, p.191, and Swete, p.220.

3. Swete, p.217 regards Job as one of the four poetical books and omits Song of Songs. On p.220, however, he indicates that Josephus maintained the same Canon as later Judausm (including Song), therefore his grouping on p.217 is erroneous.

complete Canon consists of twenty-four books.[1] This would agree with the above counting, except that Judges and Ruth as well as Jeremiah and Lamentations have to be counted separately. Since Josephus, through his use of the Septuagint, was influenced by the Greek tradition, it is quite possible that he followed the Greek system here too, just as Church Fathers did later, although they professed to followe the Hebrew tradition.[2] Where Greek influence was strong Judges and Ruth were combined, as were Jeremiah and Lamentations.

Another possibility is that Josephus counted two books less because at that stage two of the later canonical writings had not yet been included. Some scholars think these two books must have been Ecclesiastes and Song of Songs.[3] If these two books are omitted,

---

1. Here we follow Ryle, pp.201 and 229-33 (where he not only refers to the Jerusalem Talmud, Sanhedrin X, 1, but also indicates that the tradition speaking of twenty-two books, which also occurs among the Church Fathers, is based on the Greek or Alexandrian tradition, cf. Keil pp.670-72), and Wildeboer, pp.11-12 (where he points out that there is no clearly Hebrew tradition with respect to twenty-two books except perhaps in Jubilees) - contra Eissfeld, p.771 (but after having said that he regards the addition of Ruth to Judges and Lamentations to Jeremiah as the older tradition, he goes on to refer immediately e.g. to the Prologue of Ben-Sira to prove that the tripartite division of the Canon which contradicts his previous assumption, "ziemlich früh feststand".). The fixed number of twenty-four books is emphasized in the Midrash on Numbers (XIV, 4), cf. Cohen, p.145.

2. So especially Melito, Origen and Jerome, who count twenty-two books in accordance with the number of letters in the Hebrew Alphabet, cf. Ryle, pp.229-32, Keil, pp.667 (Origen) and 674-75 (Jerome) and Wildeboer pp.78 (Origen) and 81-83 (Jerome). Jerome however does mention the separation of Ruth from Judges and Lementations from Jeremiah. Cf. also Swete, pp.222-23 (who indicates the influence of Origen).

3. Thus Grätz, quoted by Ryle, p.177; also mentioned as a possibility by Sellin-Rost, p.176.

two others should then come into the third group mentioned by Josephus. Lamentations could join Psalms as "hymns to God", and then only Job seems to remain as the other book of "practical precepts". According to another theory it was Ecclesiastes and Esther that were not counted by Josephus.[1] Bearing in mind, however, that Ecclesiastes was formally included in the Canon at Jamnia almost at the same time as Josephus was writing and the fact that Josephus most probably referred to Esther in dating the end of the prophetic era in the time of "Artaxerxes", as well as the fact that Song of Songs was formally included in the Canon not later than A.D.65,[2] we are justified in doubting these theories; and taking cognizance of the plausible explanation that Josephus was influenced by the Septuagint, we may safely decide that his twenty-two books were the same as those included in the Hebrew Canon of Scripture in Talmudic and later times.[3]

This makes it clear that the Canon of Hebrew Scriptures at least existed in the form of an accepted and universal Jewish tradition some time before A.D.90.

---

1. Zeitlin, p.130 says these were the two books not regarded as canonical by A.D.70.

2. Cf. our previous discussions of these matters on pp.23-24 and 39 and Zeitlin, pp.157 and 131. (The fact that Josephus probably refers to Esther and not to Ezra--cf. note 1 on p.39--is significant, as it indicates knowledge of a tradition which differed from the common one. Or did Josephus merely confuse the names?)

3. Cf. also Ryle, p.177.

This may be confirmed from another source: IV Ezra, sometimes included among the Apocrypha of the Old Testament, but not regarded as canonical in Roman Catholic circles, though sometimes printed as an addendum in the Vulgate. The name varies; usually it is IV Ezra, but otherwise II Esdras.[1]

This book probably consists of various elements which were united in a final redaction soon after A.D.100.[2] The section relevant to the present discussion appears in chapter 14, which belongs to the major division of the book (chapters 3-14), which should most probably be dated in the last years of the reign of the Emperor Domitian, who died in A.D.96.[3]

---

1. Also called the "Ezra Apocalypse"; cf. Keil, p.780 and Weiser p.315. Cf. Swete, p.265.

2. Cf. R.H. Charles, Religious Development between the Old and the New Testaments, ("The Home University Library of Modern Knowledge, 94", London and New York, 1914) pp.251-52 referring to G.H. Box (cf. our next note); the arguments in this respect have also been dealt with by the present author in an unpublished booklet: "Die Apokaliptiek van Daniël, Henog en IV Esra met besondere verwysing na die Messiasverwagting", pp.71-74.

3. This date is based on the Eagle-vision in chapters 11-12, where 11:35 probably refers to the death of Titus, whereas 12:2 and 28 still foresee the death of Domitian; thus Weiser, p.318, M.A. Beek, Inleiding in de Joodse Apocalyptiek van het Oud- en Nieuw-Testamentisch Tijdvak ("Theologia VI"; Haarlem, 1950), p.52, E.J. Goodspeed, The Story of the Apocrypha (Chicago, 1939), pp.115-17 (where he also dates chapter 14 approximately A.D.100), Wildeboer, pp.40-41, cf. G.H. Box's commentary on IV Ezra in R.H. Charles (ed.), Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English: II: Pseudepigrapha (Oxford, 1913) p.552 (where Box proposes an earlier date for the section 3-13, but dates chapter 14 around A.D.100), H. Gunkel's treatment in E. Kautzsch (ed.), Die Apokryphen und Pseudepidraphen des Alten Testaments, (Tübingen, 1900), p.352, Eissfeld, p.849 and H.H. Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic: A Study of Jewish and Christian Apocalypses from Daniel to the Revelation (2d ed., London, 1947), pp.141-43. The thirty years mentioned in 3:1 should be regarded as approximately this period after the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D.70(cf.Keil, p.782 and Eissfeldt, p.849). The last years of Domitian were a reign of terror (cf. H.W. Household, Rome, Republic and Empire, vol.II: The Empire (London, 1938),pp.131-32) and at this stage the Messiah was eagerly expected.

In chapter 14 we read that Ezra, assured of his approaching end, bewailed the loss of the Holy Scriptures and prayed for the Holy Spirit to enlighten him that he might write the history of the world as it had been written in God's "Law". He was told to retire into the field for forty days, taking with him five chosen secretaries and sufficient writing material. After drinking a mixture handed to him from heaven, he received wisdom and memory, and for forty days dictated to the five secretaries, who had to eat by night. In the forty days ninety-four books were written.[1] Then the Lord commanded him to publish openly the first books that he had written that anybody might read them, but to retain the last seventy and hand them over to the wise only.

This legend therefore distinguishes seventy books(one of which was probably IV Esra) destined to be read only by a select group, probably those who could understand esoteric literature. If the total number of books is correctly stated as ninety-four, the remaining twenty-four books, intended for everybody's reading, are almost certainly the Holy Scriptures, since the Canon was indeed regarded as consisting of twenty-four books.[2] Since the number agrees with what we find in

---

1. According to the Oriental Versions; the Latin manuscripts have 904 books or 204, 84 and 974, cf. Ryle, pp.297, 168 and 250, Aalders, Kanoniek, p.29, Wildeboer, p.41, also Driver, p.V, (Zeitlin, p. 134, is inaccurate when he says "another" reading mentions 94 books).

2. Similarly Aalders, Kanoniek, pp.29-30, Driver, pp.iv-v, Eissfeldt, p.763, Ryle, pp.167-69, Wildeboer, pp.40-41, cf. Ap-Thomas, p. 6, Keil, p.662, Pfeiffer, p.64, H.W. Robinson, p.201, Sellin-Rost, p. 176 and Weiser, pp.244 and 253.

later Jewish sources, the witness of IV Ezra can be taken as another proof that at the end of the first century A.D. the Jewish Canon was definitely reckoned to include the usual twenty-four books.

According to this legend Ezra not only restored the Law as he had originally intended, but also gave Israel its entire Canon. That all the books of the Canon were written and published in the time of Ezra is also suggested by the Baraitha in the Talmud, in Baba Bathra 13^{b}-15^{a}.[1] Here it is said that Moses wrote the Pentateuch and Job; Joshua wrote eight verses in the Tôrâ and his own book; Samuel wrote Judges, Ruth and Samuel; David wrote Psalms; Jeremiah wrote his own book, Kings and Lamentations; "Hezekiah and his company" wrote Isaiah, Proverbs, Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes; "the Men of the Great Synagogue" wrote Ezekiel and the Twelve Prophets; Ezra wrote Ezra-Nehemiah and the "genealogies in Chronicles down to his own time." Unless we ascribe a peculiar meaning to the term "write", we cannot suppose that this was intended as information about the canonization of these books; but we do find a tradition similar to that of Josephus and IV Ezra; that the twenty-four books were written in the period between Moses and Ezra and that everything was concluded at about the time of Ezra. This tradition cannot be accepted as a reflection of historical events, and certainly does not claim that the Canon was finally recognized in Ezra's time.

---

1. For the text and comments, see also Ryle, pp.284-91, Driver, pp.iv-vi and Keil, p.516, but the latter's conclusions are rejected by Aalders, Kanoniek, p.30, Eissfeldt, p.763, Ridderbos, pp.188-89 and Wildeboer, p.50.

Yet these traditions of IV Ezra and Baba Bathra, together with a few others (as Neh. 8-10), have influenced scholars to think of Ezra as the publisher of the Hebrew Canon. This idea was based on the opinion of the Jewish scholar E. Levita (in 1538) who said the Scriptures had been collected and edited by Ezra and the "Men of the Great Synagogue". The concept "Men of the Great Synagogue" is in itself a subject of controversy. Some scholars regard it as a body that existed only in Ezra's own time, whereas others, judging by a statement in the Mishnah, Aboth I, 1-2, think that it was a religious court which existed until the time of Simon the Just (290 or 196 B.C.). It seems that the idea of a religious court, existing for about two centuries, rests on too slender evidence, and deals with a period of Jewish history about which Mishnaic and Talmudic teachers were so ill informed that they did not even have the slightest notion of its duration.[1] We cannot therefore base any argument on this evidence, but rather turn our attention to other data which may help in tracing the history of the Canon.

---

1. More details may be found in Ryle, pp.4, 261-83 (252-53), Driver, pp.v-vi, Eissfeldt, pp.764-65, Weiser, p.244 (who aptly remarks that the allocation of Ezra-Nehemiah, Chronicles and especially Daniel to the third part of the Canon cannot be explained by this theory), Wildeboer, pp.130-31 (who traces the "Great Synagogue" back to Neh. 8-10, where the great gathering, however, received the law but did not promulgate it), cf. also Danby, p.446. The older view is upheld to some extent by Keil, pp.515-16 (cf. Ridderbos, p.189).

Before examining the other sources of information, we conclude this chapter with the remark that all the evidence points to the ~~fact~~ probability that at the beginning of the last decade of the first century A.D. all the books belonging to the present Jewish Canon were included in a fixed number of twenty-four canonical writings, which almost every Jew believed constituted the revelation of God, given to his people in the prophetic period. These books were clearly distinguished from others in various ways and were safeguarded, even as to their textual form, from alteration, omission and addition.[1] In short this means that the Canon of the Jewish Scriptures was closed, and was regarded as having been closed for some time.

---

1. This follows from the quotation from Josephus, given above, p.38. Yet textual stability may have been the last of these characteristics to be emphasized.

Chapter III

DATA FROM THE SEPTUAGINT

The name "Septuagint", though commonly used to denote the entire ancient Greek translation of the Old Testament, should, strictly speaking, be used only for the translation of the Pentateuch, made in Alexandria about the middle of the third century B.C., for it was to this part of the Greek Bible that the legend of the seventy(-two) translators was restricted.[1] What concerns us here is not the history of this translation, nor its value for textual criticism, important though this may be, but its value for the history of the Canon.

---

1. The legend as found in the "Letter of Aristeas" §§30-32, 46 (ca. 100 B.C. or earlier) applies only to the Law, which would here be the same as the Pentateuch; cf. Aristeas, §139, 312, H.T. Andrews, "The Letter of Aristeas" in R.H. Charles, Pseudepigrapha, pp.87, 88, 98, R.H. Pfeiffer, pp.104-06, Oesterley-Robinson, p.16, Sellin-Rost, pp.19, 170, P. Wendland "Der Brief des Aristeas", Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments (Hildersheim, 1900) II, p.3, Weiser, pp.269 and 301 for further details. For the limitation of the name, cf. Swete, pp.9, 12, 17 and 23.

Now, according to later traditions this Septuagint proper was regarded as an authoritative translation and was even considered to be divinely inspired. What is important is that if such authority was attributed to the translation of the "Law" there can hardly be any doubt that the original Hebrew Tôrâ was regarded as authoritative and canonical when the Greek translation was made, which was before 250 B.C.[1] This conclusion also seems justified if we recall the veneration accorded the Pentateuch at Alexandria not only in the writings of Philo, but also in earlier sources.[2]

Later the name "Septuagint" was applied to the Greek translations of the various other Jewish Scriptures, done by different translators with widely divergent capabilities, and eventually the term was used for the Greek Old Testament, including the Apocrypha.

After the translation of the Pentateuch, translations of the Hebrew "Prophets" were probably undertaken--this time almost certainly by private enterprise; yet before the year 150 B.C. this work had probably been concluded, and even standardized.[3] It is a well known

---

1. Similarly Ap-Thomas, p.5, R.H. Pfeiffer, pp.57 and 106, Swete, p.218, Ryle, pp.90 and 155, though Weiser (p.247) and Wildeboer (p.33) think that the translation was not originally regarded as authoritative.

2. Cf. Ryle, pp.180-81 and Sellin-Rost, p.180; and "Letter of Aristeas", §§ 139, 312-16.

3. Cf. R.H. Pfeiffer, p.67 and Ryle, pp.117-18, and Swete, p.24.

fact that the Septuagint translations of both Samuel and Jeremiah differ greatly from the Massoretic text. This leads to the supposition that these books were translated from the Hebrew before the text had finally been settled and therefore before we may apply our strict ideas of canonicity to these books.[1] It is, however, open to debate whether our ideas of canonicity, which include a standard text, were indeed also the concepts of the ancient Jews. If a standard text is, nevertheless, regarded as a necessary characteristic of any canonical work, then either the "prophets" were not considered canonical before about 150 B.C., or Samuel and Jeremiah at least were translated before they became "canonical". H.E. Ryle implies that these translations were made before 200 B.C. because he states that "the Canonicity of the Prophets had been accepted there (in Alexandria) since the beginning of the second century B.C."[2]

By the year 132 B.C., when the grandson of Ben-Sira probably wrote the prologue to the Greek translation of his book, some or all of the "Hagiographa" had also been translated into Greek. We have direct evidence that the book of Esther was translated into Greek in

---

1. Thus H.B. Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (revised by R.R. Ottley; Cambridge, 1914) p.218.

2. Ryle, p.118, cf. his p.117 and Weiser, p.248 for the argument. We should note, too, that Alexandria probably lagged behind Palestine in recognizing books as Scripture; Swete (p.23) definitely maintains this with regard to the "Prophets".

178 or 114 B.C.[1] These translations were done by different individuals and were uneven in quality--some of them (especially among the Hagiographa) being very free renderings.

The arrangement of the books in the Septuagint differed from the standard Hebrew division of "Law, Prophets and Writings". The "Law" was still retained as the first five books, for which the name Pentateuch became current, but the rest of the books were arranged in more or less topical groups of history, poetry and wisdom literature, and then prophecy.[2] Accordingly a number of scholars maintain that there was no distinction in Alexandria between the Jewish writings, except in the case of the Tôrâ.[3] To some extent this is true, but it was certainly not always the case, for there is no doubt that the grandson of Ben-Sira knew a very distinct group of "prophets" which he groups beside the "Law" and distinguishes from other ancient Jewish writings.[4] Moreover, Philo's quotations are limited to books of the

---

1. For a discussion of the evidence regarding Esther, cf. Wildeboer, p.34 (-35) (we prefer to let both possible dates stand), where he states that Esther was probably one of the last books to be translated, cf. also Ryle, p.155, Oesterley-Robinson, p.16, Weiser, p.270. Kuhl (p.29) and Sellin-Rost (p.19) think that possibly the whole Old Testament had been translated into Greek by 132 B.C.

2. Cf. Swete, pp.217-20. For further comment see e.g. Ryle, pp. 224 and 235, where he points out that the question of sequence only arose in later times when "books" were no longer written on separate scrolls, or when lists of the Sacred Writings appeared. This seems to be the correct refutation of the theory of Eissfeldt (p.773) that the Septuagint represents an older Jewish tradition than the Hebrew Canon. Eissfeldt's view seems to disagree with Swete, p.217.

3. R.H. Pfeiffer, p.67, Weiser, p.250, cf. Keil, pp.662-3, Kuhl, p.38.

4. Swete, p.217, even ascribes knowledge of the tripartite division to the grandson of Ben-Sira.

Hebrew Canon.[1] It is true of course that the Septuagint, as we posses it, contains more books than the Hebrew Canon and that these are interspersed among the books that belonged to the Hebrew "Prophets" as well as "Writings", but it should be borne in mind that the manuscripts in which these features occur, date almost entirely from the fourth century A.D. onwards and that these manuscripts were prepared by Christians.[2] It would therefore be possible, on the basis of this evidence, to investigate the Christian views about the Canon, but hardly the Jewish views of pre-Christian times.[3] Until the history of the

---

1. Cf. Swete, p.226 (who adds that there are no certain allusions to the Apocrypha in Philo), Ridderbos, pp.191-92, also Wildeboer, p. 35-36, R.H. Pfeiffer, p.68, Ryle, pp.156, 158-59, Keil, p.661 and Aalders, Kanoniek, p.50.

2. F. Kenyon, Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts (4th ed.; London, 1939) pp.62-69 surveys all the important manuscripts of the Greek Old Testament and indicates that from the second century B.C. to the end of the third century A.D. only parts of the Tôrâ and Prophets have been found (and this applies also to Greek texts at Qumran, cf. Eissfeldt, pp.960-61), except for texts of Psalms, Daniel (probably including the Apocryphal section on Bel) and Esther. Therefore the only "apocryphal" text to be found thus far dating before A.D.300 is the possible inclusion of Bel in one manuscript from the third century A.D. Milik, p.32, mentions that "small fragments" from Qumran Cave 7 "seem to give part of the Epistle of Jeremy in Greek". If this proves to be the case then this would be a notable exception (cf. our chapter VII).

3. We do not wish to deny the existence at an early stage of most, or all, of the books of the Septuagint, nor to deny the Jewish origin of most or all of them; but the only definite information we have, is that the Jews rejected the Septuagint as it existed in the second century A.D. and had a new translation prepared by Aquila. Swete, p.226, clearly implies that the admixture of the Apocrypha was not accepted by Jewish scholars, although this "might nevertheless seriously mislead ordinary readers, and start a false tradition in an unlettered community such as the Christian society of the first century".

Septuagint can be more clearly determined, it would be safer to maintain that the Septuagint offers very little evidence on the ideas of the early Jews of Alexandria on the extent of the Canon.[1] (Even if we wanted to accept an "Alexandrian Canon" its exact extent would be extremely difficult to determine.[2])

Those books in the Septuagint that do not belong to the Hebrew Canon are commonly called the "Apocrypha", a term originally used for books that were "hidden" from public use and reserved for a select number who could understand and appreciate their hidden wisdom. Origen and the Greek Church then used the term for the Edifying Books which

---

1. Cf. Wildeboer, pp.34-35, Ryle, p.180 and Ridderbos, p.192. It could be argued that the Christians would have based their Canon on the one used by the early Jews; but the inclusion of the New Testament would have encouraged a looser concept of the Canon among Christians, cf. the addition of the "Epistle of Barnabas" and the "Shepherd" of Hermas to the New Testament in Codex Sinaiticus as late as the fourth century, or the inclusion of the two Epistles of Clement in the contemporary Codex Alexandrinus (cf. Kenyon, pp.131, 136 and for the "Song of Mary", Wildeboer, p.34). The fact that most or all of the Apocrypha were of Jewish origin (cf. Wildeboer, p.35 and Rowley, Growth of the O.T., p.172) does not alter the case, for the whole New Testament except Luke and Acts was also probably written by former Jews. (For the present uncertainty on the history of the Septuagint, cf. Eissfeldt, pp.962-63. Cf. also R.H. Pfeiffer, p.68).

2. Cf. our pp.54-55. The Hebrew manuscripts after A.D.100 differ in arrangement, but not in contents, as the manuscripts of the Septuagint do.

are now often called Pseudepigrapha (an inappropriate designation because only some of these books are really pseudepigraphic, whereas some of the "Apocrypha" are themselves pseudepigraphic).[1] The term "Apocrypha" as used in this dissertation was first used by Jerome and became common in the Churches of the Reformation.[2] There is however some confusion about the number and arrangement of these "Apocrypha", since the ancient manuscripts and lists that have come down to us disagree among themselves, thus making it rather precarious to speak of a "Canon of the Septuagint" or of Alexandria, and where this term is used it is merely as a brief and convenient means of referring to the books that do not appear in the Hebrew Canon but do appear in manuscripts of the Septuagint or in ancient lists.

The most complete list would include the additions to Daniel and Esther, Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremy, I-IV Maccabees (of which only I-II Maccabees are accepted as canonical in the Roman Church

---

1. Even among the books published by Charles and Kautzsch (cf. note 3 on p.43 and cf. Weiser, pp.8, 299, 301 and 326) under the "Pseudepigrapha" at least Jubilees and "Fragments of a Zadokite Work" are not pseudepigraphic, and since the discoveries at Qumran even such books as the Qumran-Milḥâmâ, - Sèrèk and - Hôdāyôt have been included in this group (cf. Sellin-Rost, pp.174-75 and even Eissfeldt, pp. xiii-xiv, but cf. his pp.776-777) making this term quite inappropriate. Terms like "Apocalyptical Books" or "Sectarian Books" are also inappropriate. We therefore propose the term "Edifying Books" instead of Pseudepigrapha, otherwise we should use the term "Apocryphal" for these books, as in the Greek and Roman Church (including Augustine), cf. Oesterley-Robinson, pp.9-10, and call the present "Apocrypha" "Deutero-Canonical".

2. Cf. Oesterley-Robinson, pp.9-10, Eissfeldt, 775-76 and Weiser, p.250.

according to the Council of Trent, , 1546), Judith, Tobit, Ecclesiasticus (also called Wisdom of Sirach), Wisdom of Solomon; III Ezra (I Esdras) and the Prayer of Menasseh (which are included after the New Testament by Roman Catholics); often also the Psalms of Solomon (and "Odes") are included. IV Ezra (II Esdras) does not occur in the ordinary Septuagint manuscripts, but is included after the New Testament in the Vulgate.[1] In most of the manuscripts of the Septuagint not all of these books are included, nor are they always arranged similarly. The names--or most of them--however, often appear in lists of the Scriptures compiled by the Church Fathers, thus indicating that most of the Christians (at least up to the Reformation)

---

1. Cf. Eissfeldt, p.776, Oesterley-Robinson, p.9 and R.H. Pfeiffer, p.69 (where he states that the Codex Vaticanus contains the books as in the Roman Canon, omitting only Maccabees but including I Esdras), also Aalders, Kanoniek, pp.50-52, H.W. Robinson, p.187, Weiser, p.250 and Wildeboer, p.35. Luther included among the "Apocrypha" the books that were accepted by the Roman Church (including the Prayer of Manasseh) that were not in the Hebrew Canon; similarly the Confessio Belgica, VI adding also IV Ezra). The edition of the Septuagint by Rahlfs includes Odes, cf. A. Rahlfs, Septuaginta: Id est vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX Interpretes (2 vols., 4th ed., Stuttgart, 1935) II, 164-83. Swete, p.265 mentions the same list (the additions to Esther and Daniel are obviously not mentioned separately), omitting the Prayer of Menasseh and IV Ezra; cf. his pp.282-83 and 519 regarding Psalms of Solomon and Odes.

regarded these books as canonical.[1] This attitude may be ascribed to their lack of knowledge of Hebrew, for such a scholar as Jerome took a stand against these books on the ground that they were not a part of the "hebraica veritas". The Eastern Church maintained the Hebrew Canon (plus Baruch)[2] at the Councils of Laodicea (360-364) and Constantinople (1632), but at the Council of Jerusalem in 1672, Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus of Sirach, Tobit, Judith (and Maccabees?)

---

1. The Apostolic Fathers contain a number of references to the Apocrypha according to the edition of K. Lake, The Apostolic Fathers with an English Translation (2 vols., "Loeb Classical Library", London & Cambridge Mass., 1912-13), II, p.393. The earliest of these sources relevant to our discussion, is I Clement, written about A.D. 95-96 from Rome, cf. E.J. Goodspeed, The Apostolic Fathers : An American Translation (Chicago, 1950) p.48 and B.H. Streeter, The Primitive Church (New York, 1929) p.101. In I Clem. 55:4 reference is made to the story of Judith (and Judith 9:11 may be quoted in 59:3-4). I Clem. 61:2 possibly refers to Tobit, and in 3:4 and 27:5 (perhaps also 7:5) he may quote from Wisdom 2:24; 12:12 and 12:10 respectively. Ignatius, writing from Smyrna between A.D.110 and 117 (Goodspeed, p. 204, Streeter, p.101) may possibly quote from Judith 16:14 in his Ephesians 15:1. Polycarp writing from Ephesus around A.D.115, (Streeter, p.110; Goodspeed, p.237) possibly quotes Tobit 12:9 in his Philippians 10:2. The dates of the Barnabas-Epistle and "Pastor" of Hermas are uncertain, the former coming from Egypt between A.D.70 and 140 (cf. Streeter, p.110, Lake, I, pp.337-38), the latter from Rome between A.D.95 and 140, (cf. Goodspeed, pp.97-98, Streeter, p.101, Lake, I, p.310 and II p.3). Barnabas probably quotes Wisdom 2:12 in 6:7, and in 12:1 quotes IV Ezra (4:33 and 5:5) as a prophet! Hermas possibly quotes II Maccabees 7:28 in Mandate I, and quotes Ecclus. 18:30 in Vision 3, vii, 3. In the period A.D. 95-135 there are clear indications that Christian writers regarded II Maccabees, Judith, Tobit, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom of Solomon and IV Ezra as Scripture. Keil (pp.667-68) indicates that Irenaeus (ca. 185) used Baruch and the additions to Daniel as if they were prophecies, though Justin (ca. 150-60) quotes none of the Apocrypha except the additions to Daniel.

2. It should be noted that Origen (according to Eusebius), followed by Hilary, added "the Epistle" to Jeremiah; this probably included both the Epistle of Jeremy and Baruch. This is due to influence of the Septuagint and should not be taken as a Jewish tradition; cf. Keil, pp.669-70, 675, Ryle, p.218, Swete, p.222 and Wildeboer, p. 79.

were added.[1] (These books of the Septuagint are often quoted by the Church Fathers, but they also fairly often quoted books that dit not belong to either the Hebrew or Greek Canon, as for example the Book of Enoch).[2]

In about A.D.130 these books that did not belong to the Hebrew Canon were rejected and condemned by Judaism, leaving hardly any trace of having been discussed (except Ecclesiasticus and I Maccabees). Then the Septuagint was no longer acknowledged, and a new, literal Greek translation of the books accepted at Jamnia was prepared by Aquila.[3] Among the later Jewish scholars some attributed authority to Ecclesiasticus of Sirach, even quoting it as Scripture--probably by mistake; but there are no indications that there were official deliberations about its admission into the Jewish Canon, only statements in the Talmudic

---

1. The Hebrew tradition was also supported by Cyril of Jerusalem (ca. 315-386), Epiphanius (ca. 315-403) and Athanasius (295-373), the latter however, mentioning Esther, Wisdom (of Solomon), (Wisdom of) Sirach, Tobit and Judith as outside the Canon, but highly esteemed. (For similar convictions cf. Keil, p.675). The wider Canon of the Septuagint was, however, favoured especially in the West, eg. by the Canones Apostolorum, Augustine, the Councils of Hippo (393) and Carthage (397); cf. the details in Keil, pp.671-79, Aalders, Kanoniek, pp.50-51, R.H. Pfeiffer, p.69, Swete, pp.222-23, Ryle, pp.219-20 and Weiser, p.255 (who differs from Aalders on the decision of the Council of Jerusalem); also Aalders, Bijbelsch Handboek, p.337, Ridderbos, p.192 and Sellin-Rost, p.183.

2. References occur in Keil, p.668.

3. Thus R.H. Pfeiffer, p.68, cf. Oesterley-Robinson, p.8 (dating the rejection a score of years later), Keil, p.663 and Rowley, Growth of the O.T., p.172.

literature that it belonged to the "extraneous books".[1] The reason why it is mentioned and quoted is probably because it was originally written in Hebrew and was popular among the Jews for some time.

Another of the "Apocrypha" originally written in Hebrew, is I Maccabees, and although it was regarded as a valuable historical source, for example by Josephus, it does not seem to have ever been regarded as Scripture among the Jews.[2] Among the remainder of the Apocrypha a number never existed in Hebrew or Aramaic (like II Maccabees and Wisdom) and for this reason alone were never considered for entry into the Canon. Others like Tobit (and probably Judith) were written in Hebrew or Aramaic, but there is still no evidence of any

---

1. Cf. note 1 on p.29 above. Jerome in giving the Hebrew tradition, expressly excludes "Hiesu filii Sirach Liber" together with Wisdom (of Solomon), Judith, Tobias and "Pastor" from the Canon (cf. Wildeboer, p.82). This prove , however, that this book was popular among Christians, and the discoveries at Qumran (cf. chapter VII), Massada and in the Cairo Gᵉnîzâ proves its popularity among the Jews (cf. for two texts from Qumran, Milik, p.31, Schubert, p.10 and V.d. Ploeg, Vondsten, p.136; for the five texts from Cairo, Eissfeldt, p.811).

2. Cf. Ryle, pp.194-95, Wildeboer, pp.82 and 100, where it is mentioned that Origen and Jerome still knew the Hebrew original of I Maccabees. Wildeboer (p.100) thinks it was excluded from the Hebrew Canon because it was clearly written after the time of Ezra. This presupposes that this theory of the Canon already existed soon after this book was written about 100 B.C. (Sellin-Rost, p.166, Eissfeldt, p.785 and Weiser, p.284), otherwise I Maccabees would have been included in the Canon, especially under the Hasmonaeans. Therefore Wildeboer's opinion implies that the Canon was virtually or finally closed in the last century B.C. (Another theory is that I Macc. was excluded because it was unfavourable to Pharisaism, but this is not so important according to Wildeboer).

thought of or attempt at including them in the Canon.[1]

Taking everything into account, we may safely conclude that the Septuagint does not represent a definite Canon of Scriptures.[2] For this there is too much confusion about the exact contents of the Septuagint itself. Even if we regard all possible books mentioned in the lists and contained in the manuscripts as parts of the "Canon of the Septuagint", we find that none of these books not in the Hebrew Canon (except Ecclesiasticus of Sirach, and then only in a very limited way) was ever seriously regarded as Scripture by official Judaism; and it is even doubtful what the standing of these writings was among the Jews of Alexandria, since our witnesses to them are all from Christian sources, dating from the third century onwards.[3] The one important witness to the Jewish attitude at Alexandria is Philo, who was born about 20 B.C. and died about A.D.50.

---

1. Cf. Ryle, pp.195 and 197. The Jews in Alexandria may perhaps have considered "all writings translated from the Hebrew or Aramaic as sacred" (R.H. Pfeiffer, p.67), but this definitely was not the opinion elsewhere. (For Tobit in Hebrew and Aramaic cf. Milik, p.31, La Sor, p.45 and Schubert, p.10; for the Greek origin of II Maccabees, Wisdom and Prayer of Manasseh cf. Sellin-Rost, pp.166, 168, 169, cf. La Sor, p.45).

2. Ap-Thomas, p.4, E.E. Flack, "Canon of Scripture", Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge: An Extension of the New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge (Editor-in-Chief, L.A. Loetscher; 2 vols., Grand Rapids Mich., 1955) I, 204, Ridderbos, p.192, Ryle, p.180, Sellin-Rost, p.180 (who point out the very important place of the Pentateuch, which certainly was canonical), Weiser, p.250, Wildeboer, p.33 and especially Keil, pp.661-63 (where he indicates that in Alexandria the distinction between divinely inspired books and others was lost, because wisdom was regarded as the source of inspiration, cf. Aalders, Kanoniek, p.50); cf. Oesterley-Robinson, p.8 (where it is stated that from a Christian standpoint one could speak of a "Greek Canon", but on p.9 it becomes clear that the extent of this "Canon" is uncertain!)

3. Among Christians there were also considerable differences of opinion as to which books should be included, cf. our pp.54-57 with notes and references.

Though in no way directly concerned with the history of the Septuagint, Philo obviously used the Septuagint version of the Scriptures in his writings.[1] Therefore not only is he an early Jewish witness to the use of the Scriptures at Alexandria, but his attitude toward the Septuagint may reflect a fairly general tendency among the Alexandrian Jews at the beginning of our era. Although he knew and used the Septuagint and sometimes regarded every wise man as inspired, he never quoted the books of the Apocrypha.[2] He generally referred to the authors of the canonical books as "prophets", but regarded Moses as by far the most important among them; as a matter of fact he sometimes considered only the Pentateuch as divinely inspired and as absolute Canon.[3]

At least we may say of the data so far that the Canon, as it was later accepted at Jamnia, was at this stage already being formed and that Philo agreed with the later Jewish Canon.[4]

---

1. There are signs of different recensions of the Septuagint of the Pentateuch in his work, as was shown by P. Katz, Philo's Bible: The Aberrant Text of Bible Quotations in Some Philonic Writings and its Place in the Textual History of the Greek Bible (Cambridge, 1950).

2. Aalders, Kanoniek, p.50 mentions one exception: a possible quotation from Ecclesiasticus; but he also mentions the fact that Philo sometimes quotes from Greek authors. (See also our note 1 on p.52 above, for similar views).

3. Keil, p.656, R.H. Pfeiffer, p.67, Ryle, p.158. It is significant that all the texts discussed fully by Katz are from the Pentateuch except two from Psalms (pp.24 and 47) and one from I Kings,(p. 30).

4. Similarly Wildeboer, pp.35-36. Swete, p.25, states that Philo refers to the books of the Hebrew Canon except Ruth, Eccl., Cant., Esther, Lam., Ezekiel and Daniel, but Ruth was probably joined to Judges and Lamentations to Jeremiah, and Ezekiel would be regarded as a prophet. (This would leave the four underlined books as the ones not used by Philo).

In his De Vita Comtemplativa Philo mentions that the Therapeutae in their cells used only the "laws and oracles, delivered by prophets, and hymns and the other (books) by which knowledge and piety are mutually increased and perfected" (§3; ii, 475).[1] Here we have an obvious reference to the tripartite division of the Hebrew Canon, the reference to the third division being somewhat similar to that of Josephus and of Jesus in Luke 24:44. The authenticity of this tract has been questioned, but since the discoveries at Qumran the probability of the existence of the Therapeutae has increased. A most cautious conclusion would be to say that we are not sure about this witness (De Vita Contemplativa), but that it fits into the general pattern of the period before A.D.50. It does not define the exact limits of the Canon, but it is important as an Egyptian witness (whether from Philo or from a later period) to the tripartite division of the Hebrew Canon.[2] All the data derived from Philo point in the same direction: support for the Canon accepted by the Jews after Jamnia.

Summarizing the data from the Septuagint itself,[3] we may say that the Septuagint as a whole is fairly unimportant in a study of the

---

1. The text and translation is found in Ryle, pp.298 and 160-61. For doubts about its authenticity cf. also Aalders, Kanoniek, p.42 and Wildeboer, p.37.

2. Cf. Eissfeldt, pp.768-69 and Keil, p.662.

3. Data about the Canon derived from the contents of individual books in the Septuagint (I and II Maccabees and Ecclesiasticus) will be discussed in chapter 5, since these books constitute pre-Christian witnesses to the Canon.

Jewish Canon, because it does not seem to represent a purely Jewish tradition, especially in the form in which it has been handed down to us by the early Church. It does however, by its origin, witness to the authoritative character of the Pentateuch as early as the middle of the third century B.C.; and by the character of the translations of Samuel and Jeremiah it indicates that these books were probably regarded as important enough to be translated into Greek before 200 B.C., although their text at that stage was not regarded as immutable.

Chapter IV

DATA FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT

In discussing the data from the New Testament we should bear in mind that the New Testament is not the work of a single author and may therefore reflect different approaches. Nevertheless, it is the accepted literary product of a distinct group--the Christians who were at this stage still closely linked with the Jewish tradition. As a matter of fact, it is probable that all the books of the New Testament except Luke and Acts were written by former Jews.[1] Moreover these books were all written within the fairly brief period roughly between A.D.45 and 95. No less a scholar than W.F. Albright is prepared to date the entire New Testament before the Council of Jamnia, for he

---

1. Doubts about the Jewish character of the Johannine writings have lost much of their ground since the discovery of the Qumran texts, cf. W.F. Albright, "Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of St. John", The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology (Studies in Honour of C.H. Dodd, ed. by W.D. Davies and D. Daube, Cambridge, 1954) pp.153-71 especially 170-71 (hereafter cited as Albright in Background of the N.T.) and R.E. Brown, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles", The Scrolls and the New Testament, (ed. by K. Stendahl, New York, 1957), p.206 where he says that "the tradition of the Fourth Gospel is local Palestinian".

says: "In general, we can already say emphatically that there is no longer any solid basis for dating any book of the New Testament after about A.D.80."[1] If we accept this view, the importance of the data of the New Testament becomes quite obvious, since we have data preceding the discussions at Jamnia--in some parts even preceding Jamnia by a half a century.

Before discussing the use of the Old Testament in the New, it is important to note that scholars do not always agree even on the occurrence of citations, and still less on the occurrence of allusions to and reminiscences of the Old Testament. There is necessarily some difference of opinion on such matters.[2] We shall therefore give only a summary of the obvious citations of the Old Testament in the New Testament.

Definite quotations as Scripture, Word of God, Law or Prophetic Word:[3]

---

1. W.F. Albright, Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands (Supplement to Young's Analytical Concordance to the Bible, New York, 1955) p.136 --his italics. (Hereafter cited as Albright, Recent Discoveries). His formulation may be somewhat rash, but gives enough support to an early date for most of the books of the New Testament.

2. Cf. Du Plessis, pp.39-46. He gives the following numbers of citations, allusions, and reminiscences respectively for each of the books of the Hebrew Canon as they occur in the words of Jesus recorded in the Gospels: Genesis: 2,7,7; Exodus: 6,2,14; Leviticus: 3,7,6; Numbers: 0,2,1; Deuteronomy: 11,11,15; Joshua: 0,0,0; Judges: 0,1, 2; Samuel: 0,1,9; Kings: 0,5,7; Isaiah; 8,18,26; Jeremiah: 0,7,8; Ezekiel: 0,7,9; Twelve Prophets: 5(Hosea 2, Jonah 1, Zech. 1, Mal.1), 19,15; Psalms: 13,12,28; Proverbs: 0,4,25; Job: 0,1,7; Ruth: 0,0, 0; Song: 0,1,3; Lamentations: 0,1,1; Ecclesiastes: 0,0,10; Esther: 0,0,1; Daniel: 0,9,10; Ezra-Nehemiah: 0,1,2; Chronicles:0,1,5. On p.52 he argues that John 5:1 refers to Purim and that Jesus thus acknowledged the authority of the book of Esther, but cf. note 3 on p.80.

3. These have been mainly taken from E. Nestle, Novum Testamentum Graece cum apparatu critico (ed. by E. Nestle, 19th ed., Stuttgart, 1949) pp.658-71; parallels from the Gospels have been taken as one occurrence--these have been indicated by parallel lines//. (Cf. also Aalders, Kanoniek, p.32).

Genesis (15 plus 1 probable case)

1:27 in Matt. 19:4 (cf. Mk. 10:6)

2:2 in Heb. 4:4

2:7 in I Cor. 15:45

2:24 in Matt. 19:5 (cf. Mk. 10:7)

2:24 in I Cor. 6:16

12:3 in Gal. 3:8

12:7 (13:15, 22:18) in Gal. 3:16

15:5 in Rom. 4:18

15:6 in Rom. 4:3

17:5 in Rom. 4:17

18:10 (18:14) in Rom. 9:9

21:10 (-12) in Gal. 4:30

21:12 in Heb. 11:18

22:16-17 in Heb. 6:13-14

22:18 in Acts 3:25

(25:23 in Rom. 9:12)

Exodus (15 plus 5 probable cases)

3:6 in Matt. 22:31-32//Mark 12:26//Luke 20:37

9:16 in Rom. 9:17

12:46 in John 19:36 (cf. Num. 9:12)

16:18 in II Cor. 8:15

20:12 in Matt. 15:4//Mark 7:10

20:12 in Eph. 6:2-3

20:12-16 in Matt. 19:18-19//Mark 10:19//Luke 18:20

(20:13 in Matt. 5:21)

20:13-14 in Jas. 2:11

20:13-17 in Rom. 13:9

(20:14 in Matt. 5:27)

20:17 in Rom 7:7

21:4 in Matt. 15:4//Mark. 7:10

(21:17 in Matt. 15:4//Mark 7:10)

(21:24-25 in Matt. 5:38)

(23:20 in Matt. 11:10//Luke 7:27)

24:6-8 in Heb. 9:19-20

25:40 in Heb. 8:5

32:6 in I Cor. 10:7

33:19 in Rom. 9:15

Leviticus (8 plus 3 probable cases)

11:44; 19:2 in I Pet. 1:16

14:2-4 in Matt. 8:4//Mark 1:44//Luke 5:14 (cf. 17:14)

(19:12 in Matt. 5:33) (cf. Num. 30:3)

19:18 in Matt. 19:19 (cf. 5:43)

19:18 in Matt. 22:39//Mark 12:31//Luke 10:27

19:18 in Rom. 13:9

19:18 in Gal. 5:14

19:18 in Jas. 2:8

(24:19-20 in Matt. 5:38)

26:11-12 in II Cor. 6:16

Numbers (1 plus 1 probable case)

9:12 in John 19:36 (cf. Ex. 12:46)

(30:3 in Matt. 5:33) (cf. Lev. 19:12)

Deuteronomy (25 plus 5 probable cases)

5:16 in Matt. 15:4//Mark 7:10 (cf. Ex. 20:12)

5:16-20 in Matt. 19:18-19//Mark 10:19//Luke 18:20 (cf. Ex. 20:12-16)

(5:17 in Matt. 5:21) (cf. Ex. 20:13)

5:17-18 in Jas. 2:11 (cf. Ex. 20:13-14)

(5:18 in Matt. 5:27) (cf. Ex. 20:14)

5:17-21 in Rom. 13:9 (cf. Ex. 20:13-17)

5:21 in Rom. 7:7 (cf. Ex. 20:17)

6:4-5 in Mark 12:29-30//Luke 10:27 (Matt. 22:37)

6:13 (10:20) in Matt. 4:10//Luke 4:8

6:16 in Matt. 4:7//Luke 4:12

8:3 in Matt. 4:4//Luke 4:4

9:4 in Rom. 10:5

9:19 in Heb. 12:21

18:15(+19) in Acts 3:22 (cf. verse 23)

18:15(+19) in Acts 7:37

(19:15 in Matt. 18:16)

21:23 in Gal. 3:13

21:1 in Matt. 19:7 and 5:31 (Mark 10:4)

25:4 in I Cor. 9:9

25:4 in I Tim. 5:18

25:5-6 in Matt. 22:24//Mark. 12:19//Luke 20:28

27:26 in Gal. 3:10

(28:49 in I Cor. 14:21) (but cf. Is. 28:11-12)

29:3 in Rom. 11:8

(30:12-15 in Rom. 10:6-9)

31:6,8 in Heb. 13:5

31:21 in Rom. 10:19

32:35 in Rom. 12:19

32:35 in Heb. 10:30

32:43 in Rom. 15:10

Joshua (1 possible case)

(1:4 in Heb. 13:5 (cf. Deut. 31:6,8)

Judges: none

Samuel (4 plus 1 probable case)

(II Sam. 7:8,14 in II Cor. 6:18)

II Sam. 7:12 in John 7:42

II Sam. 7:14 in Heb. 1:5

II Sam. 22:3-4 in Heb. 2:13

II Sam. 22:50 in Rom. 15:9 (cf. Ps. 18:50)

Kings (1 case)

I K. 19:10,14,18 in Rom. 11:2-4

Isaiah (37 plus 3 probable cases)

6:9-10 in Matt. 13:14-15

6:9-10 in John 12:39-40

6:9-10 in Acts 28:25-27

7:14 in Matt. 1:22-23

8:14 in Rom. 9:33

8:17-18 in Heb. 2:13

8:23-9:1 in Matt. 4:14-16

10:22-23 in Rom. 9:27-28

11:1 and 10 in Rom. 15:12

25:8 in I Cor. 15:54

(27:9 in Rom. 11:27)

28:11-12 in I Cor. 14:21 (cf. "Law" and Deut. 28:49)

28:16 in Rom. 9:33

28:16 in Rom. 10:11

28:16 in I Pet. 2:6 (cf. verse 4)

29:13 in Matt. 15:8-9//Mark 7:6-7

29:14 in I Cor. 1:19

40:3 in Matt. 3:3//Mark 1:3//John 1:23

42:1-4 in Matt. 12:17-21

45:23 (cf. 49:18) in Rom. 14:11

49:8 in II Cor. 6:2

52:5 in Rom. 2:24

52:7 in Rom. 10:15

(52:11 in II Cor. 6:17) (cf. Jer. 51:45)

52:15 in Rom. 15:21 (cf. I Cor. 2:9)

53:1 in John 12:38

53:1 in Rom. 10:16

53:4 in Matt. 8:17

53:7-8 in Acts 8:32-33

53:12 in Luke 22:37

54:1 in Gal. 4:27

54:13 in John 6:45

55:3 in Acts 13:34

56:7 in Matt. 21:13//Mark 11:17//Luke 19:46

59:7-8 in Rom. 3:14-16

59:20-21 in Rom. 11:26-27

61:1-2 in Luke 4:17-19

(62:11 in Matt. 21:5)

65:1-2 in Rom. 10:20-21

66:1-2 in Acts 7:48-50

Jeremiah (5 plus 2 probable cases)

(3:16 in I Cor. 2:9) (cf. Is. 64:3)

7:11 in Matt. 21:13//Mark 11:17//Luke 19:46

9:23(24) in I Cor. 1:31

31:15 in Matt. 2:17-18

31:31-34 in Heb. 8:8-12

31:33-34 in Heb. 10:15-17

(51:45 in II Cor. 6:17) (cf. Is. 52:11 and Ezek. 20:34)

Ezekiel (1 probable case)

(37:27 (cf. 20:34)in II Cor. 6:16-17)

Twelve Prophets (17 plus 1 probable case)

Hos. 2:1,25 (1:10 and 2:22 in translations) in Rom. 9:25-26

Hos. 6:6 in Matt. 9:13 and 12:7

Hos. 11:1 in Matt. 2:15

Hos. 13:14 in I Cor. 15:55

Joel 3:1-5 (2:28-32 in translations) in Acts 2:17-21

Joel 3:5 (2:32 in translation) in Rom. 10:13

Amos 5:25-27 in Acts 7:42-43

Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15:16-17

(Jonah 2:1 in Matt. 12:40)

Micah 5:1 in Matt. 2:5-6 (cf. John 7:4)

Hab. 1:5 in Acts 13:40-41

Hab. 2:4 in Rom. 1:17

Hag. 2:6 in Heb. 12:26-27

Zech. 9:9 in Matt. 21:4-5//John 12:15

Zech. 11:12-13 in Matt. 27:9 (quoted as Jeremiah)

Zech. 13:7 in Matt. 26:31//Mark 14:27

Mal. 1:2-3 in Rom. 9:13

Mal. 3:1 in Matt. 11:10//Luke 7:27; Mark 1:2

Psalms (44 plus 5 probable cases) (verse numbers in English translation in brackets)

2:1-2 in Acts 4:25-26

2:7 in Acts 13:33 (called second Psalm)

2:7 in Heb. 1:5; 5:5 (cf. 7:28)

5:10(9) in Rom. 3:13

8:3(2) in Matt. 21:16

8:5-7(4-6) in Heb. 2:6-9

10:7 in Rom. 3:14

14:1-3 in Rom. 3:10-12 (cf. Ps. 53:2-4)

16:8-11 in Acts 2:25-28 (cf. verse 31)

18:50 in Rom. 15:9 (cf. II Sam. 22:50)

(19:5(4) in Rom. 10:18)

(22:16(15) in John 19:28)

22:19(18) in John 19:24

22:23(22) in Acts 2:12

32:1-2 in Rom. 4:7-8

35:19 and 69:5(4) in John 15:25

36:2(1) in Rom. 3:18

40:7-9(6-8) in Heb. 10:5-7 (cf. 8-9)

41:10(9) in John 13:18

44:23(22) in Rom. 8:36

45:7-8(6-7) in Heb. 1:8-9

(50:14 in Matt. 5:33)

51:6(4) in Rom. 3:4

53:2-4(1-3) in Rom. 3:10-12 (cf. Ps. 14:1-3)

68:19 (18) in Eph. 4:8-9

69:10(9) in John 2:17

69:10(9) in Rom. 15:3

69:23-24 (22-23) in Rom. 11:9-10

[redacted]:24 in John 6:31

82:6 in John 10:34-35 (quoted as "your Law")

91:11-12 in Matt. 4:6//Luke 4:10-11

94:11 in I Cor. 3:20

95:7-11 in Heb. 3:7-11, 15; 4:3-11

97:7 in Heb. 1:6

102:26-28 (25-27) in Heb. 1:10-12

104:4 in Heb. 1:7

109:8 in Acts 1:20

110:1 in Matt. 22:43-44//Mark 12:36//Luke 20:42-43

110:1 in Acts 2:34-35

110:1 in Heb. 1:13

(110:4 in John 12:34)

110:4 in Heb. 5:6 and 7:21

112:9 in II Cor. 9:9

116:10 in II Cor. 4:13

117:1 in Rom. 15:11

(118:6 in Heb. 13:6)

118:22-23 in Matt. 21:42//Mark 12:10-11//Luke 20:17

135:14 in Heb. 10:30

140:4(3) in Rom. 3:13

Proverbs (3 cases)

3:11-12 in Heb. 12:5-6

3:34 in James 4:6 (cf. Septuagint)

25:21-22 in Rom. 12:20

Job (1 case)

5:13 in I Cor. 3:19

Daniel (1 case)

9:27; 11:31 and 12:11 in Matt. 24:15//Mark 13:14

Ruth, Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Esther, Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles: none.

The data may be summarized as follows: giving the number of undoubted citations, followed by a figure which included the very probable cases (in brackets):

Tôrâ: 63(78): Genesis 14(15), Exodus 15(20), Leviticus 8(11), Numbers 1(2), Deuteronomy 25(27).

N^{e}bî'îm: 64(73): Joshua0(1), Judges 0, Samuel 4(5), Kings 1(1), Isaiah 37(40), Jeremiah 5(7), Ezekiel 0(1), Dodekapropheton 17(18).

K^{e}tûbîm: 49(54): Psalms 44(49), Proverbs 3(3), Job 1(1), the five M^{e}gillôt 0, Daniel 1(1), Ezra-Nehemiah-Chronicles 0.

In considering the three main divisions separately we must give some attention to the following facts. All the books of the Tôrâ are quoted as Scripture, but not equally frequently. From Numbers there is only one definite quotation whereas there are twenty-five

from Deuteronomy, which proves that some books were either more popular than others or contained more material that lent itself to quotations.

The use of Ex. 3:6 in Christ's discussion with the Sadducees (Matt. 22:31-32//Mark 12:26//Luke 20:37) calls for some comment. Here the hermeneutical method of Jesus need not be discussed, but the question must be answered why this text from the Tôrâ was used and not for example Is. 26:19 (cf. 25:8) Ezek. 37:12-13 and Dan. 12:2-3. Was it because Isaiah, Ezekiel and Daniel were not recognized as Scripture by Jesus or the Sadducees? This could not be the reason for elsewhere Jesus certainly quoted from Isaiah and Daniel, and probably used Ezekiel as Scripture.[1] Scholars have therefore assumed that the Sadducees did not recognize these books as Scripture, but only the Tôrâ.[2] It is more probable however that the Sadducees held only to the written Law and rejected the oral Law which played such an important part in the views of the Pharisees.[3] They would then have accepted the N^{e}bî'îm as Scripture, but for them, as for all Jews, the final authority would

---

1. Cf. the summary of quotations above and note 2 on p.64. For the purpose of this survey all the words attributed to Jesus by the Gospels are regarded as words of Jesus.

2. Weiser, p.253, cf. Du Plessis, p.153 note 355. This view is derived from Tertullian and Jerome, according to Keil, p.664. This has been refuted by some modern scholars as indicated by Keil, p.664. Wildeboer (pp.127-28) and Du Plessis (pp.152-53) maintain the view that the Sadducees accepted the whole Canon. Wildeboer thinks that in recognizing books other than the Tôrâ the Sadducees yielded to the pressure of the scribes.

3. This view is also expressed by La Sor, p.198 (who refers to Josephus). The greater authority of the Law in comparison with the other Scriptures is indicated by Van Selms, Lofprijzingen, p.168.

be the Tôrâ, and therefore Jesus quotes from the Tôrâ. At any rate we have no clear proof that the Sadducees held that only the Tôrâ was canonical.[1]

We also notice great differences in the number of quotations drawn from the various books of the N^{e}bî'îm. Isaiah, with at least thirty-seven clear quotations, ranks second only to Psalms as the book most frequently quoted in the New Testament. On the other hand there are no specific quotations in the New Testament from Joshua, Judges and Ezekiel and only one from the books of Kings. Taking the twelve "minor" prophets separately, we find no quotations from Obadiah, Nahum, Zephaniah (and Jonah), but bearing in mind the brevity of the books and the fact that there are allusions to these books, there is no serious objection to the status of these "minor" prophets. Their canonical position is assured by the fact that the Jews always united them into one book with the other "minor" prophets, which are quoted as Scripture in the New Testament.[2]

What appears more serious is the absence of quotations from Joshua, Judges and Ezekiel, although there are numerous allusions to the latter in the New Testament, especially in the Apocalypse.[3]

---

1. Wildeboer (pp.127-28) refers to Cheyne who said that the Sadducaean author of I Maccabees loved both the Psalms and the prophecies; but today many scholars doubt whether this author can be Sadducaean at all.

2. Cf. also Ridderbos, p.190.

3. Cf. Nestle, pp.668-69 and note the probable quotations from Ezekiel in II Cor. 6:16-17, cf. also note 2 on p.64.

Perhaps the reason for the infrequency of quotations from Ezekiel was the same reluctance to use the book widely as was noted in discussing the Rabbis. Joshua 1:4 is possibly quoted in Heb. 13:5 and there are other references to the Book of Joshua in the New Testament.[1] The possible verbal allusions to Judges in the New Testament are not clear, but in Heb. 11:32 the names of four of the Judges appear, clearly indicating that in New Testament times Judges was certainly regarded as a record of events between the books Joshua and Samuel (cf. Acts 13:20), and therefore as part of the prophetic Canon.[2]

There are such numerous references to "the Prophets" and "the Law and the Prophets" in the New Testament, that we may be sure, in view of the foregoing data, that the N^{e}bî'îm as they were later handed down by Jewish tradition, belonged to the canonical books according to the New Testament authors.[3] Indeed, in the time of Jesus "the Prophets" were read in the Synagogue in the same way as was "the Law" (Acts 13:27; Luke 4:16-17; Acts 13:15 ff;)--indicating that it was certainly

---

1. Jos. 1:1-2 and 14:7 possibly coined the phrase that Moses was the servant of the Lord, as found in Rev. 15:3; and in Heb. 11:31 and Jas. 2:25 (cf. Matt. 1:5) there is a definite reference to Rahab, whose history is described in Josh. 2, cf. 7:22-23. R.V.G. Tasker, The Old Testament in the New Testament, (First American edition, Grand Rapids, 1963) pp.69-70 (hereafter cited as The O.T. in the N.T.) sees the sin of Ananias and Sapphira as a repetition of the sin of Achan (Josh. 7).

2. Cf. Ecclus. 46:13. For other possible allusions see Nestle, p.661 and Du Plessis, p.41.

3. Cf. Du Plessis, pp.22-23.

regarded as Scripture, as Word of God.[1]

There are no definite statements about the reading of the K^etûbîm in the Synagogue in this period, although it has been pointed out that before the destruction of the temple in A.D.70 the High Priest read from Job, Ezra or Chronicles or Daniel the night before the Day of Atonement; and Psalms were almost certainly widely read and used in the worship in the temple and the synagogue. The five Scrolls (M^egillôt) were later definitely assigned to be read on the various festivals: Song of Songs at Passover, Ruth at Feast of Weeks (Pentecost), Lamentations at the commemoration of the destruction of Jerusalem (9th of Ab), Ecclesiastes at Tabernacles (Booths), Esther at Purim.[2]

When the New Testament refers to "the Law and the Prophets", the "Writings" are not necessarily excluded,[3] as is clear from the instances where even a Psalm, from the K^etûbîm, may be quoted as coming from the "Law" (John 10:34; 15:25; cf. 12:34).

---

1. Ryle, p.127; Wildeboer, pp.9-10 and 144. The reading of the Haftarôt was probably not yet done according to the system later adopted by the Rabbis as recorded in the Talmudim. Wildeboer points out that the various divisions probably had names like "Elias" (Rom. 11:2) and "the bush" (Mark. 12:26).

2. Wildeboer, p.144 and Ryle, pp.244-45.

3. E.g. Matt. 5:17; 7:12; 22:40; Luke 16:16, 29, 31; Acts 28:23 (cf. 13:15?) Wildeboer, p.48, Weiser, p.251, cf. Du Plessis, pp.22-23 contra Ryle, p.128. For Daniel cf. also Robinson, p.200.

There can be no doubts about the canonical status of the Book of Psalms in the New Testament, for not only is it directly quoted more frequently than any other book of the Hebrew Old Testament (at least forty-four times), but in Luke 24:44 "Psalms" is mentioned together with the Law and Prophets as the authoritative witnesses to Christ. Whatever is understood by this term, it is clear that the book of Psalms was regarded as canonical in New Testament times. In view of the definite quotations from Proverbs, Job and Daniel, and other obvious allusions to these books, doubts about their canonical status can hardly be justified.[1]

The books from the Kᵉtûbîm from which no definite quotations have been found in the New Testament are the five Mᵉgillôt and Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles, though Matt. 1:5 is probably dependent on the book of Ruth (cf. Ruth 3:21). Matt. 23:34-35//Luke 11:51 may refer to Chronicles (II Chr. 24:19-20)[2] and Matt. 1:7-12 is probably dependent on I Chr. 3:10-17. Scholars generally contend that Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, Esther and Ezra-Nehemiah are not quoted in the New Testament,[3] but we should probably add Lamentations. Among these

---

1. Cf. Nestle, pp.662, 665, 669-70.

2. Cf. the discussion below. Moreover I Chr. 15:6 and 16:35 may be reflected in Matt. 24:7//Mark. 13:8//Luke 21:10 and Acts 26:17 respectively.

3. E.g. Aalders, Bijbelsch Handboek, p.335, Kanoniek, p.33, Eissfeldt, p.769, Kuhl, p.37, New Bible Handbook, p.31, H.W. Robinson, p. 199, Ridderbos, p.190, Ryle, p.161-62, Weiser, p.251, Wildeboer, pp. 51 and 145; cf. Du Plessis, pp.38, 46-47 and Sellin-Rost, p.181.

scholars H.E. Ryle and others hold that this does not prove that these books were not canonical, since they were unlikely to supply matter for quotation in the New Testament.

It is fairly certain that if Chronicles was acknowledged as canonical, so was Ezra-Nehemiah, since they were probably originally one book.[1] Moreover the fact that Ezra-Nehemiah generally precedes Chronicles in the Hebrew canonical arrangement is often interpreted as indicating that Ezra-Nehemiah was generally acknowledged as canonical at an earlier stage than Chronicles.[2]

John 7:38 refers to a statement of Scripture which cannot be easily located. It is most probably a general summary of concepts derived from various texts of the Old Testament--among them Song of Songs 4:15. However, it is not a definite allusion to this book; nor are the passages possibly reminiscent of Song 5:2, 6 in Rev. 3:20 and Luke 12:36, Song 8:6 in Matt. 16:18 or Song 8:7 in Matt. 13:44, 46 definite enough for us to come to any conclusion about the status of Song of Songs.[3] The most likely reference to Song of Songs is in

---

1. H.W. Robinson, p.199, Ryle, p.162, Wildeboer, p.51, cf. New Bible Handbook, p.31 and Du Plessis p.47. Texts like Ezra 5:11, Neh. 9:6 and 9:29 may be reflected in Matt.11:25//Luke 10:21, in Acts.4:24, and in Luke 10:28 (cf. Matt. 19:17//Mark 10:19//Luke 18:20) respectively, but the New Testament may have derived them from Gen. 24:3, Ex. 20:11 and Lev. 18:5 respectively.

2. For this arrangement see Ryle, pp.292-94 and for the probable reason, p.151, cf. also Wildeboer, p.151.

3. Cf. especially Du Plessis, pp.48-49 and G.Ch. Aalders, Het Hooglied: Vertaald en Verklaard ("Commentaar op het Oude Testament", Kampen, 1952), p.17; on p.10 he mentions the allegorical interpretation among the Jews which preceded this sort of interpretation among Christians.

Eph. 5:23-32, if we accept the idea that the allegorical interpretation of Song of Songs, as indicating the love relationship between God and His people, was already current at that time (cf. also Song 4:7 and Eph. 5:27).[1]

There are a number of texts in the New Testament which may be reminiscent of Ecclesiastes, for example Eccl. 6:3 in Matt. 16:26 // Mark 8:36 //Luke 9:26; Eccl. 7:20 in Rom. 3:10; Eccl. 11:4-6 in John 3:8, but in none of these are the allusions so clear that we can establish anything about the canonical status of this book.[2]

It has been suggested that Mark 6:23 shows acquaintance with Esther 5:6 and 7:2. This however is not certain. The feast mentioned in John 5:1 is probably the Festival of Purim, but the fact that Jesus attended the festival is no final proof that He regarded the Book of Esther as canonical.[3] Among the Church Fathers there was some uncertainty about Esther, as may be seen from the omission of Esther from the list of canonical books compiled by Melito of Sardes

---

1. S. Anema, Het Hooglied: Proeve eener nieuwe Verklaring (Kampen, 1928), pp.7-8 indicates that the Targum paraphrased this book in an allegorical way as indicating the relation between God and Israel, and ascribes it to the first century A.D.

2. Cf. also Eccl. 4:17 and Luke 23:34; 5:1 and Jas. 1:19 and Matt. 6:7, 9; 5:14 and Luke 12:20; 9:10 and John 9:4; 11:1-2 and Luke 16:9; Du Plessis, p.48, Wildeboer, p.51 and Sellin-Rost, p.181. "The Shepherd" of Hermas (A.D.950-140) quotes Eccl. 12:13 in Mandate 7:1.

3. Du Plessis, pp.49-52, cf. the problem with John 10:22. For Mark 6:23 cf. Wildeboer, p.51 and Nestle, p.662. On John 5:1 see F.J. Botha, "Die Fees van Johannes 5:1", Deo Gloria, XII (1952), 41 and 43.

(ca. A.D.170) and later, and from the fact that it is mentioned with Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus of Sirach, Judith and Tobit among the anaginōskómena by Athanasius.[1] On the other hand Esther is definitely mentioned, and Esther 4:16 virtually quoted, in I Clement 55:6, which dates from about A.D.95.

Scholars generally do not doubt the canonical status of Lamentations in the New Testament, yet the proofs for this are no stronger than for Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes and Esther.[2]

On the other hand these facts do not constitute proofs that these books were not regarded as Scripture by the New Testament authors; this would be a dangerously unscientific argumentum e silentio. The reason for lack of quotations from these books may simply be that there was no occasion or reason for quoting them, especially since even far longer books, such as Numbers (from the Tôrâ!), Kings and Ezekiel (from the Nᵉbf'îm) and Job, are hardly cited. Moreover, the contents of many of these books did not provide such apt quotations. Therefore all that can be said about the books just discussed is that the evidence from the New Testament shows that they were almost certainly known and used, but the evidence concerning their canonical status is not conclusive.

---

1. Cf. Aalders, Kanoniek, pp.52-53 and note 1 on p.57 above.

2. Lam. 2:1 may for example have influenced the phraseology of Matt. 5:35, but this is no proof of its canonicity.

Applying the most exacting criteria to the evidence of the New Testament, we may state that the New Testament clearly acknowledges all the books of the Hebrew Canon as Holy Scripture, except that the evidence concerning four of the Megillôt (Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations and Esther) is not decisive.

******

The question should, however, still be asked whether the New Testament recognizes other books, outside the Hebrew Canon, as Scripture.

First of all this question has to be answered regarding the Apocrypha of the Septuagint. Most scholars state that the Apocrypha are never quoted nor ever referred to as Scripture in the New Testament,[1] but there are a number who do not agree; one of the most noted among the Protestant scholars being G. Wildeboer.[2] Wildeboer states that there are numerous reminiscences and quotations from Apocryphal writings in the New Testament, but when he proceeds to enumerate these, he mentions (H.W. Robinson also) only one supposed quotation

---

1. Aalders, Bijbelsch Handboek, p.335, Kanoniek, p.32, Keil, p. 662 Kenyon, p.34, R.H. Pfeiffer, p.66, Ryle, p.164, and especially Du Plessis, pp.53-57.

2. Wildeboer, pp.51-53, cf. H.W. Robinson, pp.203-04; contra Du Plessis, p.38 and 57 and Ryle, p.164.

from the Septuagintal Apocrypha in the New Testament, and that is the possible reference in Heb. 11:34-35 to the martyrdom of Eleazar and the seven brothers recorded in II Macc. 6:18-7:42. In the first place it should be noted that far from being a quotation, this is at best a reference, and even this cannot be proved. But since it is quite possible that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written to a group in some way descended from the Ḥăsîdîm, like the Qumran Sect,[1] there is no reason why there could not be an allusion to an impressive event in the time of the Ḥăsîdîm, which happened to be recorded in II Maccabees too. This does not prove that the books of the Maccabees were regarded as canonical, especially since there are no other indications that any of the Apocrypha included in the Septuagint were thus used in the New Testament.[2]

---

1. Cf. H. Kosmala, Hebräer-Essener-Christen: Studien zur Vorgeschichte der frühchristlichen Verkündigung ("Studia Post-Biblica I", Leiden, 1959) pp.vii-x, 38 and passim, (Kosmala on p.vii refers to Y. Yadin's communication in Scripta Hierosolymitana, IV, 36-55), Burrows, DSS, p.337 and Schubert, pp.136-37. A. van Selms orally pointed out that Heb. 11:37-38 could refer to the Qumran Sect and its leader; if Wildeboer's argument were valid, then the author of Hebrews must also have regarded some Qumran writings as canonical.

2. The other reminiscences mentioned by Wildeboer (Wisdom of Solomon 3:3-7 in I Pet. 1:6-7; Wisd.7:26 in Heb.1:3; and Wisd.13-15 in Rom.1:20-32; and Ben-Sira 4:29 and 5:11 in James 1:19; Ben-Sira 36:20 in I Cor. 6:13) are so vague that even Wildeboer admits that in these cases the Apocryphal passages merely influenced the N.T. authors. These may, however, simply be cases where similar thoughts were expressed independently by different authors. Du Plessis, pp.56-58 mentions quite a number of possible reminiscences from the Apocrypha, but finds that all these may also be derived from the Old Testament, and therefore he ascribes the similarities that do exist to the influence of the Old Testament on both groups of authors.

There are however a few instances where the New Testament does quote, or seems to quote, books outside the Old Testament; but where this is so, the books do not belong to the Apocrypha included in the Septuagint either.[1] The texts quoted in this connection are: Matt. 27:9; Luke 11:49; John 7:38; I Cor. 2:9; Eph. 5:14; II Tim. 3:8; Heb. 11:35-37; James 4:5; Jude 9, 14-15. Jerome recorded that he found the words which Matt. 27:9 ascribes to Jeremiah, in a Hebrew apocryphon of Jeremiah which was shown to him by someone from the Nazarene sect.[2] It may be, however, that the source shown to Jerome was a later composition, based on this text, and that the quotation was indeed mainly derived from Zech. 11:12-13, although Matthew may also have had Jer. 18:2-12; 19:1-15 and 32:6-9 in mind.[3]

---

1. These and the following statements are mainly derived from Wildeboer, pp.52-54 and Ryle, pp.165-66, but also compare Du Plessis, pp.53-55, Flack, p.204, R.H. Pfeiffer, p.66, Ridderbos, pp.190-91, Sellin-Rost, p.181 (who says we are uncertain about the sources of these quotations) and Weiser, p.251.

2. Cf. Wildeboer, pp.53-54, R.H. Pfeiffer, p.66, contra Ryle, pp.165-66.

3. Another view, namely that Jeremiah stood first among the prophetic books (as is the case in the Talmud, cf. Ryle, p.293) and therefore represents the whole prophetic literature, is mentioned by F.W. Grosheide, Het Heilig Evangelie volgens Mattheus ("Commentaar op het Nieuwe Testament", 2nd ed. Kampen, 1954), p.420. An objection to this is the fact that in these times scrolls probably had no fixed sequence. (In this respect the "Minor Prophets" should be regarded as one book).

Luke 11:49 and John 7:38 are sometimes called quotations from unknown "apocryphal" books.[1] Some scholars however think that in Luke 11:49 Jesus refers to Himself as "the wisdom of God" and therefore does not intend it as a quotation,[2] but it seems better to regard this expression as a reference to God the Father (cf. Matt. 26:64 and Luke 2:14 where the Name of God is circumscribed by other terms). Then this is simply a general reference to God's purpose, or it may be related to texts like Jer. 7:12-29; Prov. 8:22-9:3; II Chron. 24:19. At any rate a reference to a definite non-canonical book has nowhere been indicated. John 7:38 is similar, though here there is a definite reference to Scripture. However, here Jesus has in mind not one specific passage from the Old Testament but probably a concept found in various passages such as Is. 58:11 (cf. 43:20; 44:3; 55:1), Ezek. 47:1-12 (cf. 36:25-26) Joel 4:18; Zech. 13:1 and 14:8.[3]

---

1. R.H. Pfeiffer, p.66, Weiser, p.251 and Wildeboer, p.53. A refutation of this view is given by Du Plessis, pp.53-56, cf. Ryle, pp. 165-66 and Ridderbos, p.190.

2. Du Plessis, pp.54-56, cf. A.B. Bruce, "The Synoptic Gospels", The Expositor's Greek Testament (ed. by W.R. Nicoll, 5 vols, Grands Rapids, n.d.), I, p.285, cf. Matt. 11:19. The other view is mentioned by Du Plessis and by S. Greijdanus, Het Heilig Evangelie naar de Beschrijving van Lucas ("Kommentaar op het Nieuwe Testament, III", 2 vols., Amsterdam, 1940), I, p.574.

3. A clear analysis of the sources of this quotation was given by P. Grelot "Jean, vii, 38: eau du rocher ou source du Temple?", RB, LXX (1963), 43-51. He regards this (cf. pp.48-50) as a combination of Ezek. 47:1-12 and Zech. 14:8 based on a Rabbinic tradition which may already have occured in a Targum (the Palestinian Targum on Zech. 14:8?) in Jesus' time.

Such conbinations of texts with certain key-words were common among the Jews of this period.[1]

According to some Church Fathers I Cor. 2:9 and Eph. 5:14 are derived from the Apocalypse of Elijah.[2] Since we do not know this book, and it might probably have been composed after these New Testament books, some scholars prefer to regard these as complex quotations from various texts: I Cor. 2:9 referring to Is. 52:15; 64:3 (verse 4 in translations); 65:17 and Jer. 3:16, whereas Eph. 5:14 refers to Is. 60:1 (cf. 9:1, 26:19; 52:1) or to an ancient Christian hymn or a word of Jesus otherwise unknown.

According to Origen II Tim. 3:8 is derived from the book of Jannes and Jambres,[3] but this may be a deduction from the fact that

---

1. Cf. Grelot, pp.49-50, where he refers to the Rabbinic custom, and to A. Fuillet's investigation where the same procedure is indicated in the Fourth Gospel; for example John 19:36 is based on Ex. 12:46, but strongly influenced by Ps. 34:20. For a similar treatment of Biblical texts at Qumran, see chapter VIII below.

2. The first text according to Origen and the second according to Epiphanius, cf. R.H. Pfeiffer, p.66 and Wildeboer, p.53 (cf. Weiser, p.251, only regarding I Cor.) The contrary view is held by Ryle, p.166, H.W. Robinson, pp.203-04, cf. Ridderbos, p.190, F.W. Grosheide, De Eerste Brief van den Apostel Paulus aan de Kerk te Korinthe ("Kommentaar op het Nieuwe Testament, VII", Amsterdam, 1932), p.101, G.G. Findlay, "St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians", The Expositor's Greek Testament (ed. W.R. Nicoll, 5 vols., Grand Rapids, n.d.), II, p.780, S.D.F. Salmond, "The Epistle to the Ephesians" (in the same series), III, p.360, F.W. Grosheide, De Brief van Paulus aan de Efeziërs ("Commentaar op het Nieuwe Testament", Kampen, 1960), p. 82, and various other commentaries.

3. Thus R.H. Pfeiffer, p.66, cf. Wildeboer, p.52. For other views cf. Ryle, p.165, Weiser, p.251, N.J.D. White, "The First and Second Epistles to Timothy", The Expositor's Greek Testament (ed. W.R. Nicoll 5 vols., Grands Rapids, n.d.), IV, p.172 and C. Bouma, De Brieven van den Apostel Paulus aan Timotheus en Titus ("Kommentaar op het Nieuwe Testament, XI", Amsterdam, 1942), pp.319-20.

these names occur in this verse; otherwise such a book may have been based on this verse. This information is sometimes ascribed to an unknown source, but it is better to regard it as an oral tradition, since the names also occur in the Talmud and various other ancient writings. At any rate we have no quotation here, and therefore no indication that such a source could be regarded as canonical.

Hebr. 11:35-37 is probably based mainly on oral tradition, even if verse 37 containsan allusion to the book "Ascension of Isaiah" or "Martyrdom of Isaiah".[1] Since there is no quotation here, this case may be treated in the same way as II Tim. 3:8 and as the possible reference to the Maccabaean history in these and the preceding verses. No deductions can be made about canonical status for any of these books.

James 4:5 refers to what Scripture says, but the origin of the quotation is difficult to locate. Various authors think of it as having an unknown source,[2] others maintain that it combines the essence

---

1. Wildeboer, p.52, R.H. Pfeiffer, p.66, and Ryle, p.165.

2. R.H. Pfeiffer, p.66, Weiser, p.251; the contrary view is held by F.W. Grosheide, De Brief aan de Hebreeën en de Brief van Jacobus ("Commentaar op het Nieuwe Testament", 2nd ed., Kampen, 1955), p. 395, Aalders, Kanoniek, p.32 (who also refers to John 7:38 and Gal. 3:22), and R.V.G. Tasker, The General Epistle of James: An Introduction and Commentary ("The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries", London, 1957) pp.91 and 105. Notable is the view of W.E.(sic) Oesterley, "The General Epistle of James", The Expositor's Greek Testament (ed. by W.R. Nicoll, 5 vols., Grands Rapids, n.d.), IV, p.459 that the quotations come from the writings of St. Paul. This, however is in itself rather doubtful: it means that Paul's writings existed and were regarded as Scripture by the author of the Epistle of James! Flack, p.204 and Ryle, p.164 also mention Jas1:9, 19, and W.E. Oesterley mentions Jas. 1:12, but these are not quotations, and various texts apart from Ecclesiasticus, may be indicated to which these verses allude, cf. Nestle, pp.578-79.

of various Old Testament texts, for example Gen. 6:3-7 and Zech. 8:2 (cf. Ex. 20:5; 34:14).

Jude 9 is probably derived from the Assumptio Mosis,[1] but this story as it stands, is not present in the extant part of this book and may therefore be based on oral tradition. Again there is no quotation and therefore no proof at all of canonical authority for the "Assumption of Moses".

In Jude 14-15 however there is a definite reference to and probable quotation from the non-canonical book of Enoch (1:9).[2] The method of citing the words would lead us to suppose that the author of this Epistle may have included Enoch in the Canon. Yet H.E. Ryle remarks that "there never seems to have been any idea among Jews that the book of Enoch might be included in the Canon; and we can hardly consider the fact of its being quoted by Jude as a proof that its

---

1. According to Origen, cf. R.H. Pfeiffer, p.66, Ryle, p.165, Wildeboer, p.52, and according to Clement of Alexandria, mentioned by S. Greijdanus, De Brieven van de Apostelen Petrus en Johannes en de Brief van Judas ("Kommentaar op het Nieuwe Testament, XIII", Amsterdam, 1929), p.627 (who prefers the view that it is from an oral source) and J.B. Mayor, "The General Epistle of Jude", The Expositor's Greek Testament, (ed. by W.R. Nicoll, 5 vols, Grands Rapids, n.d.) V, p.263.

2. Cf. Flack, p.204, Ryle, pp.165 and 166, Wildeboer, p.53, Mayor, p.270, contra S. Greijdanus (cited in the previous note) who thinks even in this case of oral tradition. "Non-canonical" is used here in its modern sense, though it may have been regarded as canonical in some divisions of the Church and at Qumran (For the latter see chapter VII below).

claims were ever gravely considered".[1] Further weight may be placed on Ryle's view by recalling that the New Testament in fact also quotes pagan Greek authors such as Aratus in Acts 17:28 and Epimenides in Titus 1:12 (cf. Menander in I Cor. 15:33).[2] Nobody would venture to argue from these quotations that Paul regarded the writings of these Greek authors as canonical Scripture! Therefore we may justifiably doubt whether even Enoch was cited as Scripture in the New Testament.

Taking the greatest possible number of non-canonical writings into account, we can say that there are allusions to a number of them in the New Testament, but at the most the Apocalypse of Elijah and the Book of Enoch may have been quoted as canonical, for the sources of the supposed quotations are not even mentioned by ancient Christian authors in the other cases, or those sources that are mentioned by name in ancient books are merely referred to in the New Testament and not quoted. We repeat that a number of the unidentified quotations from Scriptures in the New Testament are merely free treatments of Old Testament texts, several being combined to produce a single "quotation".

******

1. Ryle, p.166, cf. p.165.

2. Cf. Ridderbos, p.190, Nestle, pp.355, 543 and 454 and H.W. Robinson, p.203.

Turning our attention to the general references to the Scriptures in the New Testament, we note that in II Cor. 3:14 these books are called "the Old Testament or Old Covenant".[1] More common however is the expression "the Scripture" or "the Scriptures". To these divine authority was attributed (Matt. 5:18; Mark 14:49; Luke 22:37; John 10:35; Acts 1:16; 13:47; cf. Matt. 1:22 and elsewhere),[2] and they seem to have formed a definite body of writings and a unity, for John 10:35 says: "Scripture cannot be broken", and 5:39: "You search the Scriptures, because you think that in them you have eternal life" (R.S.V.). In some instances the entire Old Testament seems to be included under the term "the Law" as in John 10:34 which quotes a Psalm (82:6) as written in "your Law", and Matt. 5:17-18 where "Law and Prophets" are mentioned and then referred to simply as "Law". This leads to the conclusion which was formulated as follows

---

1. Aalders, Kanoniek, p.33, who indicates that the words refer to books that may be "read". Dronkert, p.107 even thinks that this is a name for the present Old Testament as a unity.

2. Ridderbos, p.190, who also indicates that sometimes "the Scripture" refers to a definite text (in John 13:18 etc.), but often to the whole Old Testament (John 2:22; 7:42 etc.), which, according to Aalders, Kanoniek, pp.31-32 and 40-41, proves the unity, cf. Bijbelsch Handboek, pp.334-35, where numerous texts occur, as also in Du Plessis, pp. 18-21 and Dronkert, p.106. For John 10:35 compare Tasker, The O.T. in the N.T., p.24, Wildeboer, pp.47-48, New Bible Handbook, p.31. Keil, p.522, points to the expression "Holy Scriptures" in Rom.1:2 and "the oracles of God" in Rom. 3:2 (cf. also Keil, pp.656-57).

3. Cf. also I Cor. 14:21 which probably quotes Is. 28:11-12 as "Law" and other examples mentioned by Aalders, Kanoniek, pp.32 and 41, cf. Bijbelsch Handboek, I, p.338, Du Plessis, p.22, Dronkert, p.107, and Wildeboer, p.48.

by H.H. Rowley: "The New Testament offers evidence that most of it (the Old Testament) could be appealed to as authoritative before the Council of Jamnia met ...."[1]

In the same sentence Rowley goes on to state that even at that time the Old Testament was already known by its threefold division, according to Luke 24:44. Here Christ is reported as saying "that everything written about me in the law of Moses and the prophets and the psalms must be fulfilled" (R.S.V.). The reference to the first two parts of the Canon, the Tôrâ and N^{e}bî'îm, is clear; but the interpretation of the term "Psalms" has given rise to differences of opinion regarding the third part of the Canon, the K^{e}tûbîm. It has been argued that "Psalms" here refers only to the Biblical book of Psalms, since only this book refers to the suffering of Jesus (Luke 24:46);[2] but the reference is not merely to the suffering of Jesus but to His whole ministry according to "the Scriptures" (Luke 24:45; cf. 46-47). Others have therefore regarded "Psalms" as a term by which the third part of the Canon is indicated--the name of the first and most important book

---

1. Rowley, Growth of the O.T., p.170.

2. Cf. Wildeboer, p.49, also pp.47, 48, although on p.136 he acknowledges that Psalms formed the basis of the Hagiographa and was its most important book. The contrary view appears e.g. in New Bible Handbook, p.31.

being used to designate the whole group.[1] This seems quite probable, but it must be admitted that there is no indication in this verse of the exact contents of this third part of the Canon.[2]

Many scholars find a definite indication of the books included in the third part of the Canon in New Testament times, by referring to Matt. 23:35 and its parallel in Luke 11:51. Here Jesus speaks about "the righteous blood shed on earth, from the blood of innocent Abel to the blood of Zechariah the son of Barachiah, whom you murdered between the sanctuary and the altar" (R.S.V.). In this passage Jesus does not seem to be giving a chronological survey, for if this Zechariah is the one mentioned in II Chr. 24:20-21, who was killed "in the court of the house of the LORD", then his murder is not the last one, chronologically speaking, mentioned in the Old Testament, for the murder of Urijah recorded in Jer. 26:23 occurred much later. It is therefore assumed that Jesus is referring to the first murder mentioned in the Canon of Scriptures (Abel) and the last one in the Canon (Zechariah),

---

1. Kuhl, p.22, refers to Luke 24:27 where there are references to Moses and the Prophets and then to "all the Scriptures", which probably means more than "Law, Prophets and Psalms". Du Plessis, pp.24-27, deals in some detail with this verse and indicates various possible ways in which Psalms may indicate the K^{e}tûbîm (e.g. as pars pro toto), but also mentions the possibility that ψαλμοί represents תושבחתא "praises, hymns", which would include more than Psalms. The latter argument, however, is doubtful, in view of the probable technical meaning that ψαλμοί had acquired in this time, especially in its present context.

2. Du Plessis, pp.59, 38 (and 60, where he refers to others), New Bible Handbook, p.31, Ryle, p.161, cf. Rowley, Growth of the O.T., p.170, Aalders, Bijbelsch Handboek, I, p.335, Kanoniek, p.33, where he says that nevertheless there is reason to regard the third part as similar to the Hebrew Canon, cf. Keil, p.524.

since II Chronicles is the last book in the Hebrew Canon. From this it may be concluded that the Hebrew Canon already had its present form and contents in the time of Jesus.[1] Two major objections have however been levelled against this interpretation.

The first objection is that the Zechariah referred to is not the one mentioned in II Chron. 24:20-21. Various scholars think that this is a reference to a much later event, and specifically mention the murder of a certain Zechariah the son of Bareis (or Baruch) which, according to Josephus, occurred during the rebellion against Rome in A.D.66-70.[2] It is, of course, impossible that Jesus could have referred to this event which occurred at least three decades after His death, and that the author of the Gospel would have committed such an anachronism in connection with contemporary events, is hardly possible. Moreover, the father's names (Barachiah and Bareis) are similar but not the same, and Luke 11:51 does not mention the father's name at all. It is therefore better to assume that the reference in Matt. 23:35 and Luke 11:51 is either to an unknown person, or more probably to the Zechariah mentioned in II Chr. 24:20-21; the reason why he is called son of Jehoiada in II Chr. 24:20 and son of Barachiah in Matt. 23:35

---

1. Aalders, Kanoniek, p.33, Dronkert, p.107, Keil, pp.524, 662, Ridderbos, p.190, H.W. Robinson, p.200, Ryle, p.151, Sellin-Rost, p.181, Tasker, The O.T. in the N.T., p.23, Weiser, p.251 and various commentaries, and with some reservations Wildeboer, pp.47-49 and 14; also mentioned and discussed by Du Plessis, p.65.

2. Cf. Josephus, Jewish War iv, 5:4 (§§ 334-344), as explained by Eissfeldt, p.769, and mentioned by Du Plessis, pp.64-65.

(but not in Luke), possibly being due to the influence of the well known prophet Zechariah, whose father was Berechiah (Zech. 1:1).[1]

The other objection to the view that this verse indicates a completed Canon, is that at this stage the books of Scripture had not yet been generally written in one volume (if at all), and therefore could have had no fixed sequence with Chronicles coming last.[2] Indeed, even much later there was no unanimity about placing Chronicles at the end of the Hebrew Canon.[3] On the other hand, there must have been some reason for Jesus' use of this name, and it is possible that

---

1. H.W. Robinson, p.200, R.V.G. Tasker, The Gospel according to St. Matthew ("The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries", London, 1961), p.222, cf. Du Plessis, pp.66-67, and A.B. Bruce, "The Synoptic Gospels", The Expositor's Greek Testament (Grand Rapids, n.d.), p.286, who say this confusion may be due to an early copyist, whereas W.C. Allan, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Matthew ("The International Critical Commentary", 3rd ed., Edinburgh, 1912), p.250, thinks it is a later insertion or inserted by "the editor" of the Gospel on the basis of Jewish tradition or in accordance with the Septuagint of Zech. 1:1. Du Plessis also mentions the other views, either that the Zechariah of II Chr. 24 was called son of Jehoiada because this was his grandfather who brought him up, though his father was Barachiah; or that Jehoiada was also called "the blessed" (Barachiah); but he himself regards these as rather artificial solutions; cf. also F.W. Grosheide, Het Heilig Evangelie volgens Mattheus ("Commentaar op het Nieuwe Testament", 2nd ed., 1954) pp.352-53.

2. Wildeboer, p.50, cf. pp.14-15 where he nevertheless says that Matt. 23:35 may indicate an early tradition that Chronicles is the last book of the Canon. A fixed sequence of books in the time of Jesus is doubted by Ridderbos, p.194, cf. Aalders, Kanoniek, p.47, also Du Plessis, pp.63-64 (with reference to Jeremiah as first of the Prophetic books in Matt. 16:14, cf. 27:9).

3. Wildeboer, pp.11 and 141, Ryle, pp.240-49, but on p.235 Ryle quotes the Talmud (Baba Bathra 13^{b}) where it is indicated that in the first century A.D. (the time of Rabbis Jehudah and Eleazar, successor of Gamaliel) there were copies in which the Law, the Prophets and the Writings were each combined in one volume, cf. Wildeboer, p.141.

if He was referring to Scripture (and not to a more contemporary event), He had in mind this event mentioned in Chronicles, which would at least be the last of the historical books of His Bible, and perhaps the last in the canonical arrangement.[1] Thus the safest conclusion to be drawn from this reference in the Gospels is that it might indicate (but not prove) that Chronicles was at that time regarded as the last book of the Canon. This text per se however does not prove that the Canon existed in the time of Jesus exactly as it was later accepted by the Jews.

One point sometimes overlooked in evaluating the evidence of the New Testament for the Canon of the Old Testament, is the fact that the disputes of Jesus with the Jewish leaders were often based on the Old Testament and its interpretation (for example Mark 12:18-27, 28-34, 35-37), yet nowhere is there any intimation of any difference of opinion on the exact extent of the Scriptures.[2] This could be taken as an indication that the Canon of Scripture was generally accepted as closed at the beginning of our era. Here it should be noted that the

---

1. This is indicated even by Wildeboer, p.50, cf. p.141. The conclusion we reach would probably satisfy Wildeboer.

2. Cf. Kuhl, pp.7-8, who points out that there are more than nine hundred allusions to the Old Testament in the New, but that there is no disagreement regarding the contents of the Scriptures either in the Gospels, or in Acts (e.g. Acts 4:10-12; 7:2-53) or in the Epistles. He calls it a "bemerkenswerte Tatsache, dass die Christenheit, die damals vom Judentum bekämpft und verfolgt wurde, sich neben dem Evangelium auf die Heilige Schrift der Juden gründet".

Jewish Schools of Hillel and Shammai flourished, at about the same period, and their discussions were also based on the Jewish Scriptures, yet except for the difference of opinion on Ecclesiastes which has already been mentioned,[1] we have no indication that there were any doubts or differences among these Schools regarding the extent of the Canon of Books which should be utilized in their discussions.

Reviewing the evidence of the entire New Testament, we see no reason to doubt that Jesus and the authors of the New Testament definitely regarded and used the Tôrâ and N^{e}bî'îm as authoritative Scripture and therefore as canonical, whereas they did not so use the Apocrypha of the Septuagint, and at most used one or two other books such as Enoch in a way which might suggest canonical status. The moot question is: what exactly was their attitude toward the K^{e}tûbîm? Some scholars maintain that, especially in view of the position of the K^{e}tûbîm in the New Testament, it cannot be said that the Canon of the Old Testament was closed at this stage.[2] But the least we can do, is

---

1. Cf. p.23 above.

2. Weiser, p.251, Wildeboer, p.56 and 54 (cf. 52-53), where Wildeboer maintains that the authors of the New Testament had no idea of an exclusive Canon, although he states that there were tendencies to limit the "Holy Scriptures" to the present Hebrew Canon. Since there had been no formal decision on the Canon, Jesus and his desciples make no explicit statements in this connection, but "daarnaar gevraagd zouden zij een antwoord hebben gegeven, dat niet al te zeer afweek van de latere Joodsche telling". A more positive attitude is however, expressed by Ryle and others, cf. the next notes. R.H. Pfeiffer, pp. 66-67 mentions that the Christians used many Jewish apocalypses and related writings and translated these into various languages (Syriac, Ethiopic etc.), proving a definite interest in this literature "even when it was not formally canonized". Pfeiffer does imply however a lax view of the Canon in the early Church.

to say with H. Wheeler Robinson: "The New Testament does not enable us to say that the third part of the Canon (the Writings) was formally closed by the Christian era, but virtually at least the Writings had become a more or less definite collection, to which appeal could be made for authoritative guidance".[1] And if we are willing to give the benefit of the doubt to the Canon, we might even say that there are various reasons for regarding the Canon of the Old Testament as having been closed in New Testament times.[2]

---

1. Robinson, p.199.

2. Sellin-Rost, p.180 says (in capital letters) that for Jesus and the apostles the Scriptures were an "einfach gegebene und feststehende heilige, inspirierte, normative Grösse", while Ryle, pp.163-64, states that in the New Testament "allusions and appeals to 'the Scriptures', 'the holy Scriptures, 'the sacred writings', leave a conviction upon the mind, which is probably as strong as it is instinctive, that the writers refer to a sacred national collection which had been handed down from ages past, and whose limits could never be disturbed by addition or withdrawal". Du Plessis, pp.58, 90 and 167 comes to the conclusion that Jesus knew and used a closed Canon, and that this necessarily had to be the case, since He could only fulfil the Scriptures (Matt. 5:17; Luke 24:27, 44 etc.) if these Scriptures were a known and well-defined entity; cf. also Aalders, Bijbelsch Handboek, p.334, Kanoniek, p.33 and Dronkert, p.107.

Chapter V

DATA FROM THE PRE-CHRISTIAN PERIOD, EXCLUDING QUMRAN

Since we have thus far followed a more or less inversely chronological manner of treating the data at our disposal, working back from the generally accepted recognition of the Canon to the more ancient and less certain references, we shall follow more or less the same procedure here, and therefore, for example, treat II Maccabees before I Maccabees.

The book II Maccabees may perhaps have been written at about the same time as much of the New Testament, since it is definitely dated before A.D.70, but many scholars prefer to date it in the half-century just before the Christian era,[1] which seems a quite satisfactory conclusion.

---

1. Weiser, p.286, sets the limits for the time of composition at 70 B.C. - A.D.70. Sellin-Rost, p.166, dates it just before A.D.70, but a date between 50 and 1 B.C. is preferred by Aalders, Bijbelsch Handboek, p.331, cf. Wildeboer, p.38, whereas Eissfeldt, p.788 and Keil, p.737 date it about 50 B.C. (For the date of the letter, cf. Wildeboer, p.38).

II Maccabees 1:10-2:18 contains a letter supposedly written by Judas the Maccabee and the people of Jerusalem and Judaea to a priest and the Jews in Alexandria. Though this letter is sometimes dated in the year 188 of the Seleucid era, therefore 124 B.C., this cannot be correct, since Judas had then been dead for some time.[1] In its present form this letter is a later composition, probably to be dated shortly before 50 B.C. In this letter there are two references which merit some attention. Firstly, in 2:13, a reference to the temple worship is followed by the words: "The same things are related in the writings and in the records of Nehemiah; and how he founded a library and gathered together those (books) concerning the kings and the prophets and those of David and the letters of kings about sacred gifts."[2] Even though this source is spurious, or at least of uncertain origin, it is important since it reflects a tradition that Nehemiah (and this time <u>not</u> Ezra) had some hand in the collection of certain books relating to the worship in Jerusalem.[3] It is not quite

---

1. That the date 124 B.C. does not belong to this letter but to the preceding letter (verses 1-9) has been demonstrated by Keil, p.733.

2. The text occurs in Driver, p.iii, Ryle, p.297 and Wildeboer, p.37. Not all manuscripts are clear as to whether we should read "those books" or "those (things)", but the former suits the context, even if not original in the text.

3. Cf. Wildeboer, p.39, Sellin-Rost, p.180, Ryle, pp.112-13, Ridderbos, p.189, Aalders, <u>Bijbelsch Handboek</u>, p.331, cf. Kenyon, p.34 and Dronkert, pp.106 and 108.

clear to which books this tradition refers, but the reference to books "concerning kings and prophets" certainly reminds one of the "former and latter prophets" of the Hebrew Canon, whilst "David" reminds one of Psalms, and the "letters of kings about sacred gifts" may be understood as parts of the contents of Ezra-Nehemiah. It would be unmotivated to regard Nehemiah as the person who made the final collection of the N^{e}bî'îm and Psalms, but some rôle of importance in this connection may be assigned to him. At any rate, it is clear that the collection of the entire Canon is not attributed to him; not only is the Tôrâ not mentioned since it was regarded as older, but part of the K^{e}tûbîm seems to be excluded by the fact that only some of the K^{e}tûbîm appear to be mentioned.[1]

The second reference of importance occurs in the immediately following verse (II Maccabees 2:14): "And in the same way Judas also gathered together for us all those (books) that had been scattered by

---

1. Cf. Driver, pp.iii-iv, Ryle, pp.112-13, who does not think that this tradition refers to the final form of any one of the three sections concerned (N^{e}bî'îm, Psalms, Ezra-Nehemiah) and Wildeboer, pp.38-40 and 137 who agrees with the others, adding that this does not reflect the final collection of the Psalms; R.H. Pfeiffer, p.63, emphasizes that the passage does not claim anything definite about the Canon; cf. further New Bible Handbook, pp.29-30, but also Aalders, Kanoniek, pp.30-31 and Bijbelsch Handboek, p.332 where he regards this as a reference to the final collection of the Prophets and Psalms, cf. Ridderbos, p.189 and Keil, pp.515-16. The fact that the mention of "David" (i.e. Psalms) is supplemented by a reference to other parts of the third division, prevents one from taking Psalms as pars pro toto for the whole third division of the Canon.

the war that occurred; and they remain with us."[1] This reference to Judas the Maccabee should probably be understood in such a way that in his time there was a definite attempt to save and preserve the Scriptures. What books were included cannot however be determined from the text, although it is quite certain that the Law and Prophets were included, and probably some of the books of the K^{e}tûbîm, since II Macc. 15:9 mentions the fact that Judas encouraged his men from "the Law and the Prophets", and 8:23 mentions the reading from "the holy book"[2] (cf. the expression "holy books" in I Macc. 12:9; I Macc. 1:56-57 mentions the burning of the books of "the Law", whereas references to at least events from Samuel and Kings occur in I Maccabees--for example in 4:30 and 7:41).[3] With respect to the K^{e}tûbîm there are various reminiscences of Psalms in II Macc., and II Macc. 15:36-37 refers to the celebration of the "day of Mordecai", thus indicating that the book of Esther was well-known, though it does not prove beyond all doubt that Esther was regarded as canonical.[4]

---

1. Cf. Driver, p.iii and especially Ryle, pp.135-36 and 296. Wildeboer, p.40, says we can decide nothing from this text, although other data make it clear that at this stage the Law and Prophets were canonical; but Sellin-Rost, p.180, regards this work under Judas as the beginning of the collection of the "Writings". In Bijbelsch Handboek, p.334, Aalders maintained that at this stage the whole Canon would be included, but in his Kanoniek, pp.34-35 he admits that the reference need not be to the whole Canon, although he thinks it actually could have been to the whole or greater part of the Canon.

2. It is uncertain which book is meant; probably part of the "Law" or "Prophets" (cf. Kuhl, p.33).

3. Cf. Ridderbos, p.190 and Keil, p.656.

4. Ryle, p.150, cf. Zeitlin, p.133.

I Maccabees was probably composed about 100 B.C.[1] and already here there are some important allusions to a number of the K^{e}tûbîm, proving that it is not unreasonable to think that in the Maccabaean period at least some of K^{e}tûbîm were included among the "holy books" (12:9). There can hardly be any doubt about the book of Psalms, since I Macc. 7:16-17 quotes Psalm 79:2-3 as Scripture.[2] I Macc. 2:59-60 alludes to the contents of the Book of Daniel in the same context in which allusions are made to Biblical books by placing Ananias, Azarias, Mesael and Daniel in the same line as Abraham, Joseph, Phinehas, Joshua, Caleb, David and Elijah. This indicates the probability that the Book of Daniel was then regarded as canonical.[3] In I Macc. 9:27 there is a reference to the fact that for a considerable time no prophet had been seen "in Israel", while 4:46 and 14:41 indicate that the reappearance of a prophet was expected in the future.[4] This seems to indicate that prophecy had long ceased and that the prophetic Canon had possibly become closed.

---

1. Ryle, pp.157 and 296, Eissfeldt, p.785, Keil, p.730, Sellin-Rost, p.166, Weiser, p.284.

2. Ryle, pp.138, 157-58, Sellin-Rost, p.180, Wildeboer, p.137, One could of course argue that this reference does not prove the canonicity of all the Psalms, for there were various collections and five "books" of Psalms; but Qumran finds prove that the Biblical Psalms were not mixed with other hymns, like the Hôdāyôt, except in texts from 11Q.

3. Cf. R.H. Pfeiffer, p.64 and Ryle, pp.158 and 146-47, where he notes that I Macc. 1:54 shows acquaintance with Dan.9:24-27(?) and also mentions the fact that the Sibylline Oracles iii 396-400 (written ca. 130 B.C.) show acquaintance with Daniel too; the rise of Jewish apocalyptic in the century and a half before Christ may also indicate acquaintance with Daniel. The question remains whether we should indeed attribute the words of I Macc. 2:59-60 to the dying Mattathias, which would place them as early as 167 B.C.!

4. H.W. Robinson, p.198 and New Bible Handbook, p.30.

Summarizing the data from the Books of the Maccabees, it is evident that by 100 B.C. and probably half a century earlier, in the time of the Maccabees, not only the Law, but also the Prophets and Psalms were accepted and used as canonical, and that there was a tradition that Nehemiah collected these Scriptures. The books of the Maccabees seem also to witness to the canonical status of Daniel and possibly Esther, but it is not certain that these books, as such, were regarded as canonical in the days of the Maccabees themselves.

******

Before discussing the book of Ben-Sira itself, attention should be paid to the Prologue to the Greek translation of the Book, written by the translator most probably immediately after 132 B.C.,[1] though some scholars place the Prologue in 117 B.C. and others in 247-221 B.C.

---

1. This date is usually preferred, cf. Ryle, p.122, Bardtke, p.11, Driver, p.ii, Sellin-Rost, p.168, Weiser, p.296, Wildeboer, p.32 and Zeitlin, p.135. Eissfeldt, p.766 and 809 gives the date as 117 B.C., since he regards the translation as having been made after the death of Ptolemy VII Euergetes 170-117 B.C. (but this is not necessary). Keil, p.759 and Aalders, Kanoniek, pp.35-39 date it under Ptolemy III Euergetes, 247-221 B.C. The arguments of Aalders partly agree with those of Lagrange and J.H.A. Hart, cf. Swete, p.518 (who says this date "deserves careful examination", but cf. Swete, p.24.) Aalders points out the weakness of the generally accepted view which regards the relevant passage as indicating that the translator came to Egypt "in the 38th year ( ) of (?) king Euergetes". This translation, if correct, naturally fits only Ptolemy VII Euergetes, since there is no proof that the earlier Euergetes reigned for 38 years. It is however debatable whether does not indicate that the king is dead already, and then the reference would suit both kings. Moreover Aalders mentions that Ptolemy III is normally called Euergetes, whereas Ptolemy VII is usually called Physcon, although he is also called Euergetes Physcon.

In the Prologue, which gives the motivation for the translation, the following sentences occur: "Many and great things having been given to us by the Law and the Prophets and the others following after them ... my grandfather (or: ancestor) Jesus, after having much dedicated himself to the reading of the Law and the Prophets as well as the other books of our fathers, and having attained sufficient experience in these, himself was drawn on also to compile something pertaining to instruction and wisdom.... And not only these (proverbs), but also the Law itself and the Prophecies and the remainder of the books have no small difference when spoken in their own (language)."

Three times the Law and Prophets are mentioned in a way which not only joins them together, but also regards them as sources of "many and great things" and of "instruction and wisdom". There is every reason to believe that at least the Law and Prophets (as they were later enumerated) were regarded as definite collections of canonical writings, already translated into Greek.[1] But apart from the "Law" and the "Prophets" the Prologue also mentions another group of writings, called books of "the others following after them", "the other Books of our fathers" and "the remainder of the Books". This indicates a third collection beside the Law and Prophets, but the moot question is

---

1. Ryle, pp.118, 123, R.H. Pfeiffer, p.61, Kuhl, p.29 and Aalders, Kanoniek, pp.36 and 44.

whether this expression refers to a closed third Canon or not.[1] One way in which an answer to this question may be attempted is to determine whether the translator reckoned the book of Ben-Sira as equal to these books; but here there is divergence of opinion too.[2] The crucial words are that the author "himself was drawn on also to compile something pertaining to instruction and wisdom" after having read the Law, Prophets and ancestral Books. On the basis of the expression "himself also" (καὶ αὐτὸς) it would seem that the translator tried to equate the work of his ancestor (ὁ πάππος μου) as closely as possible, with the ancestral Books. The question may still be asked however whether this is not the personal view of the translator, who is also a descendant of the original author, and whether his views were shared by his contemporaries. It is practically impossible to answer these questions, but the least we may say is that there is no

---

1. Aalders, Bijbelsch Handboek, p.332, Kanoniek, p.35 (cf. pp.40, 42), Dronkert, pp.11, 108, Keil, pp.517, 521 (who emphasizes the definite article "the" and says that the various names do not prove the contrary) all maintain that the third division had reached its conclusion. The opposite view is expressed by H.W. Robinson, p.196, Sellin-Rost, p.177, Weiser, p.250 and Zeitlin, p.135, cf. p.140 note 81 where he mentions a Tosefta which uses the same terminology for the third division ("the Prophets, the Pentateuch or an other book"). He regards this as proof that this Tosefta was compiled before the Ketûbîm where canonized. However, it could also indicate that for some time the third division of the Canon was called "the other books". A number of scholars regard these references as too vague to enable a definite conclusion; for example Eissfeldt, p.767, R.H. Pfeiffer, pp. 63-64, Ridderbos, p.190, Ryle, p.129, 163, Wildeboer, pp.32-33.

2. Ryle, pp.153-54 and Aalders, Kanoniek, p.42, emphasize that the book of Ben-Sira is clearly distinguished from the authoritative books, whereas Sellin-Rost, p.177 and Weiser, pp.249-50 deny that there is any distinction.

decisive argument in the Prologue for or against a closed Canon of the K^{e}tûbîm. What is certain, is that, at this stage, at least some of the Books of the K^{e}tûbîm were regarded as a third group belonging with the Tôrâ and N^{e}bî'îm, since they are mentioned together no less than three times.[1]

This reference may be regarded as an indication that the tripartite division of the canonical Books was already an ancient tradition in the time of the translator and could even be dated back to the time of the Hebrew author, Ben-Sira, himself.[2]

This brings us to a discussion of the evidence of the Book of Jesus Ben-Sira (Ecclesiasticus) itself. Two divergent views are held concerning the date of its composition. The date most generally accepted falls in the early part of the second century, B.C., between 200 and 170 B.C.,[3] although a date a century earlier has also been

---

1. Cf. Driver, p.ii, Kuhl, p.29, R.H. Pfeiffer, pp.63-64 (who reckons that Psalms and probably Proverbs, Job and Daniel may have been included), Ryle, pp.129-30, 135, 154-55 (who says that from "his mention of this third group, we may fairly assume that the beginning of the formation of a third group of Sacred Books had been known for some time, and that, in his day, it might be taken for granted as known by Jews whether in Palestine or in Egypt"), Wildeboer, pp.32-33 (who says that the words of the translator indicate a well-defined collection; but we are left in doubt as to which books were included, since he does not mention them.) Cf. H. Lietzmann, Geschichte der alten Kirche (3d ed., Berlin, 1953), I, 84.

2. Cf. Aalders, Bijbelsch Handboek, p.332 and Ryle, p.10.

3. Driver, p.ii (ca. 200 B.C.); Eissfeldt, p.809 and Kuhl, p.36 (ca. 190 B.C.); R.H. Pfeiffer, p.61, H.W. Robinson, p.194, Ryle, pp. 119, 295 and Zeitlin, pp.145-46 (ca. 180 B.C.), Wildeboer, p.118 (ca. 170 B.C.) while Sellin-Rost, p.168 states that it could not have been written after 168 B.C., but rather shortly after 200 B.C. (cf. Weiser, p.296).

proposed. If we regard the reference of the translator to the author, Jesus Ben-Sira, by the term πάππος as indicating Ben-Sira, as the translator's grandfather, and if we date the translation about 130 B.C., then the probable date of Jesus Ben-Sira would be shortly after 200 B.C.; and chapter 50 of his book would refer to a high priest Simeon, who is known to have lived about that time. But there was another high priest, called Simeon the Just, who lived about 290 B.C. There are indications that Jesus Ben-Sira was a contemporary of the high priest Simeon whom he describes in chapter 50, and since his description may well be applied to Simeon the Just, the book of Ben-Sira may be dated around 290 B.C. Then πάππος in the Prologue of the translator should be taken to mean "ancestor" rather than "grandfather", or the translator should be dated in the reign of Ptolemy III Euergetes (247-221 B.C.).[1] Though there are thus reasonable arguments for dating the book Ecclesiasticus shortly after 300 B.C., the least we can say is that it reflects a position that was current just after 200 B.C.

In the Book of Ben-Sira there are many references to the Law, which indicate its divine character, the clearest being in 24:23-26 where the author says that wisdom is taught by "the Book of the covenant of God, the Most High, the Law which Moses commanded as an inheritance for the congregations of Jacob." This and other expressions

---

1. Aalders, Kanoniek, pp.38-39, Bijbelsch Handboek, pp.332-33; mentioned by Ridderbos, p.190 and Sellin-Rost, p.168.

indicate clearly that Ben-Sira regarded "the Law" as Holy Scripture.[1]

There are also a number of clear references to the "Prophets" in such a way that their contents may be regarded as authoritative or canonical in the view of the author.[2] In 49:10(12) there is a specific reference to the Book of the "Twelve Prophets" which indicates that at this stage the collection of the prophetic books had been completed.[3]

Ben-Sira also mentions some data derived from the K^{e}tûbîm, such as the reference to the deeds of Nehemiah in 49:15 and the use of the phraseology of I Chr. 16:4 (and chapter 25) in 47:9(11); there are also clear references to the Book of Psalms and possibly to Job,[4] while the Book of Proverbs is not only referred to, but also plays a

---

1. Cf. Aalders, Kanoniek, p.43, Keil, p.656, R.H. Pfeiffer, p.61 and Wildeboer, pp.30-31, where reference is also made to Ecclus.2:16; 15:1-8; 19:20-24; 25:7-11; 42:15; 35:14-36:3; 39:1ff.

2. Ryle, pp.119-21, H.W. Robinson, p.195 and R.H. Pfeiffer, p.61 all point out that especially in Ecclus. 44-50 the historical sequence of the "Former Prophets" is followed and that references are derived from the whole of the book of Isaiah, and also from Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Cf. Aalders, Kanoniek, p.44 and Kuhl, pp.36-37, contra Wildeboer, pp.31 and 118.

3. Ryle, pp.119-21, ascribes this to a tradition that was already ancient in Ben-Sira's time. The fact is also mentioned by Kenyon, p.34, Kuhl, pp.36-37, R.H. Pfeiffer, p.61, H.W. Robinson, p.195 and Zeitlin, p.121.

4. R.H. Pfeiffer, p.61 and Ryle, pp.120-21. In 49:13-14 there are references to Joshua and Zerubbabel, which may have been derived from the book of Ezra or from Haggai and Zechariah. Since the former was joined to form one book with Nehemiah to which reference is made, and the latter two belonged to the Dodekapropheton-book which is also mentioned, the exact source does not matter.

distinct part in determining the contents of Ecclesiasticus.[1] On the other hand, some of the prominent figures from the K^etûbîm are omitted from Ben-Sira's list of famous men--the most notable omissions being Daniel, Mordecai and Ezra.[2] If these omissions are merely due to the brevity of some of his references--as must be the case with Ezra--then there are no clear proofs as to whether all the K^etûbîm were already regarded as canonical or not.[3] A number of scholars think that Ben-Sira intended his own book to be included among the Scriptures on account of expressions like 24:33 (37) where it is said: "I pour forth instruction like a prophecy"--but here it is not Ben-Sira who is speaking but Wisdom personified. In 50:27-29 we read that Ben-Sira caused wisdom to flow from his heart like rain, and whoever takes it to heart shall be blessed; but even these verses do not quite justify the conclusion drawn from them.[4]

---

1. Aalders, Kanoniek, p.44, Ryle, p.141, cf. R.H. Pfeiffer, p.61.

2. Ryle, p.121 and H.W. Robinson, p.195. They also mention the omission of Job, but he was not one of the "fathers" of Israel (who are here enumerated according to Ecclus. 44:1); besides, R.H. Pfeiffer, p.61, thinks there is a possible reference to the book of Job in Ecclesiasticus. Esther (and Ruth) may have been omitted since the main characters were women. The omission of Ezra proves that too much weight should not be placed on omissions (cf. the brief treatment of Judges in 46:14-15 and the dodekapropheton in 49:12), for the reference to Nehemiah (and Chronicles--cf. note 4 on p.108) proves that Ezra-Nehemiah was known to Ben-Sira. (For Daniel see R.H. Pfeiffer, p.766).

3. Aalders, Kanoniek, p.43-44 thinks the K^etûbîm were already regarded as Canonical, but most other scholars do not agree, cf. Zeitlin, p.129 and the next note.

4. Oesterley-Robinson, pp.6-7, R.H. Pfeiffer, p.61 (who also maintains that the prophetic Canon was already closed in Ben-Sira's time), Sellin-Rost, p.177, and Wildeboer, p.31.

In conclusion it seems preferable to say that the evidence of Ecclesiasticus of Sirach indicates that by 200 B.C. (if not earlier) the Tôrâ and N^{e}bî'îm were well-defined collections of Books which were generally accepted as divinely inspired or canonical Scriptures. The evidence concerning the K^{e}tûbîm is, however, less decisive, although some of these Books, like Psalms (and probably Proverbs) certainly were treated in much the same way as the "Prophets", and by 130 B.C., or earlier, this group contained a fair number of Books and was placed next to "the Law and the Prophets". We are not able, however, to determine decisively the extent of this third group.

******

Data about the Canon in the period between Ben-Sira and the history recorded in the Old Testament are scarce; but it is a fairly well established fact that the Samaritans acknowledged only the first five books of the Jewish Canon as Scripture. Since there was considerable religious animosity between the Samaritans and the Jews in New Testament and earlier times (John 4:9; 20; Luke 9:53; cf. 10:33-36; Ecclus. 50:25-26) it is safe to presume that groups who opposed each other so definitely on religious matters, would not borrow each other's religious books. Therefore the Tôrâ must have been regarded as canonical Scripture at the stage when the schism between the Samaritans and the Jews occurred, otherwise the two texts would not have been

the same (apart from minor differences).[1] The positive statement that the common element, the Tôrâ, must have been regarded as canonical, is certainly valid, but the other statement, that only the Tôrâ could have been regarded as canonical at that stage,[2] is not so certain, for a group which severs its relations with another group may reject several of the older tenets and traditions. Thus Christianity rejected the oral Law of the Pharisees (cf. Mark 7:8; Matt. 25:16-26 etc.), and the Reformers no longer regarded the Apocrypha of the Vulgate as inspired Scriptures[3] because they went back to the earlier (Hebrew) tradition. In the same way the Samaritans might well have rejected other books that may have been regarded as canonical at the time of the schism, although this cannot be proved.

---

1. Keil, p.663, Kuhl, p.34, R.H. Pfeiffer, p.57, H.W. Robinson, p.193, Rowley, Growth of the O.T., p.169, Ryle, p.82 note 1; cf. Weiser, p.247 (who states, however, that even in the time of the Chronicler the Tôrâ did not have a "formal canonical character" because the text was not inviolable; but the Samaritan Pentateuch proves that the text was essentially fixed when the schism occurred).

2. Thus Ap-Thomas, p.5, Ryle, p.92, Wildeboer, p.110 (cf. Kuhl, p.35), contra Keil, p.663-64, who says that the Samaritans simply regarded the Tôrâ as sufficient, though they knew other Biblical books like Joshua (which they expanded with many Samaritan tales).

3. For the Reformers, cf. e.g. Aalders, p.51, where he quotes Luther as saying that the Apocrypha are not regarded as being on a level with Holy Scripture. Keil, p.664, agrees with Hengstenberg that the Samaritans rejected other Scriptures because they found them offensive, but Ryle, p.93, says some of the other Scriptures were not offensive to the Samaritans, and Wildeboer, p.110, agrees, adding that the Samaritans had a book Joshua, which differed widely from the canonical book. This may indeed prove Wildeboer's point, but may also indicate that the Samaritans rejected the book of Joshua though they knew it.

What may, therefore, be said with some certainty is that the Tôrâ must have been regarded as canonical before the Samaritan schism, but that no definite statements can be made about the remainder of the Jewish Canon at this stage, although the absence of these other books from the Samaritan Canon may possibly indicate that they were not yet generally accepted as canonical. Since some of them were probably not yet written at this stage, the latter possibility becomes a certainty in these specific cases.

What is important now is to determine when this schism took place. It is sometimes dated as far back as 722 B.C. when Samaria was destroyed and a priest was sent to teach the new inhabitants to fear Yahweh (II Kings 17:26-28),[1] but this is hardly correct, since the

---

1. New Bible Handbook, pp.29, 120-21. In this connection Ryle, pp.95-101, discusses a theory that the Samaritan Pentateuch reflects a tradition antedating 721 B.C. since it uses the paleo-Hebrew script. Tradition ascribes the change over to the Aramaic Script to Ezra (who thus tried to distinguish the Jews from the Samaritans). The legend is unhistorical and Ezra 4:7 might imply that even after the exile the Aramaic script was still regarded as something foreign, although a number of scholars think that this verse does not refer to script at all, cf. L.W. Batten, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah ("International Critical Commentary", Edinburgh, 1913), p.165, and H.H. Grosheide, Ezra-Nehemia, ("Commentaar op het Oude Testament", Kampen, 1963), I, pp.136-37. Ryle argued that the paleo-Hebrew Script was used "until the fourth or third century B.C."--today we know from the Qumran texts that this script was used for Biblical manuscripts down to about the second century B.C. Cf. the opinions about the Leviticus fragments found in Qumran Cave I, S.A. Birnbaum, The Qumrân (Dead Sea) Scrolls and Palaeography ("American Schools of Oriental Research: Supplementary Studies, nos. 13-14", New Haven, 1952) pp.12-14 (who notes Kahle's view that this script was continued to the second century A.D.), Burrows, DSS, p.98 (who quotes Cross'

priest settled at Bethel (II Kings 17:28), whereas the Samaritans worshipped on Mount Gerizim (John 4:20);[1] and in the Samaritan religion there are no traces of idolatry, as was the case after 722 B.C., according to II Kings 17:29-41.

On the other hand, the schism has been dated as late as 332 B.C. on the basis of information supplied by Flavius Josephus.[2] He records that a priest Manasseh was expelled from Jerusalem and that his father-in-law, Sanballat, made him high priest of the rival temple on Mount Gerizim, which Sanballat had built with the consent of Alexander the Great.

Many scholars, however, think that the Sanballat to whom Josephus refers is actually the contemporary of Nehemiah, and that this Manasseh is the son of Joiada, son of the high priest Eliashib whom Nehemiah expelled according to Neh. 13:28. This implies that Josephus

---

view that these manuscripts date from the second century B.C.) and D. Diringer in The Biblical Archaeologist, XIII, pp.86 and 93-95, who rejects the legend about Ezra and mentions dates ranging from 450 B.C. (Birnbaum) to post-Christian dates (Kahle and Zeitlin) for the Leviticus fragments. The date of F.M. Cross, preferred by Burrows, seems reasonable, and finally disproves the argument used by Ryle. Cf. 2a below.

1. The Samaritans do indeed call Gerizim "Bethel" but this is a late justification of their attitude and would not have influenced the author of II Kings 17.

2. Josephus, Jewish Antiquities xi, 7-8, cf. Kuhl, p.35, R.H. Pfeiffer, p.57 (who calls this a "romantic tale"), H.W. Robinson, pp. 192-93 and especially Ryle, pp.91-92.

2a. R.S. Hanson, "Paleo Hebrew Scripts in the Hasmonean Age", BASOR, no.175 (Oct. 1964), p.42 concludes that Aramaic script was primarily used by Jewish scribes from the Persian period onwards, but paleo-Hebrew script "continued to pursue its own unique development on into the Christian era."

was confused in his chronology; but on the other hand, Nehemiah does not mention the rival temple of the Samaritans, so that this event, recorded by Josephus, may indeed be dated much later than Nehemiah.[1] However, even if there was a later expulsion of a Jewish priest and the temple on Mount Gerizim was built a century after Nehemiah's time, we may still date the beginning of the schism back to the period of Nehemiah's expulsion of the grandson of the high priest Eliashib who was a son-in-law of Sanballat, which would place the schism about 430 B.C.[2]

---

1. R. Tournay, "Quelques relectures bibliques antisamaritaines", RB, LXXI (1964), 533-36 indicates that the Chronicler (whom he dates shortly before 300 B.C.) generally shows an anti-Samaritan attitude, indicating that at this stage the schism had been completed (p.533); but data from Elephantine indicate that this schism had possibly not been completed a century earlier (p.534). The rival temple on Mount Gerizim seems to have been built in the time of Alexander the Great, Shechem having been rebuilt in the fourth century B.C. according to recent excavations. Samaria was accupied by Macedonian soldiers and became a pagan city about 332, and this probably forced the Samaritans to make their religious centre at Shechem (an old sanctuary) with their temple on Mount Gerizim (pp.534-35), thus completing the schism and increasing the animosity between Jews and Samaritans. This animosity is confirmed by Ecclus. 50:25-26; possibly written less than half a century later, cf. p.110 above. Josephus and the Books of the Maccabees prove that the rival temple existed in the second century B.C. (pp. 535-36).

2. Ryle, p.93, cf. Ap-Thomas, p.5 (who uses the date of Nehemiah's arrival in Jerusalem --444 B.C.). According to Batten, p.46, the events of Neh. 13:6-31 fall between 432 and 424 B.C., also A. van Selms, Ezra en Nehemia ("Tekst en Uitleg", Groningen-Batavia, 1935), p.139 (who thinks, however, that the schism between Samaritans and Jews should be dated in the period of Alexander the Great).

The total picture with regard to the Canon which may be derived from the Samaritan evidence is not very clear,[1] but from it we may assume that at the close of Nehemiah's governorship round about 430 B.C. at least the Tôrâ was generally accepted as canonical Scripture by the Jews, and that according to other evidence there was much interest in collecting and preserving parts of what was or became a section of the Canon, as may be seen from the traditions recorded in II Maccabees concerning Nehemiah and in IV Ezra and elsewhere concerning Ezra.

(We should, however, briefly note that in 408 B.C. the Jews living at Elephantine in Egypt asked permission to rebuild a local temple of Yahweh, though this was in flagrant opposition to the stipulations of Deuteronomy.[2] This may be an argument to place the recognition of the canonical character of the Tôrâ about 400 B.C. as R.H. Pfeiffer does, probably bearing in mind his dating of Ezra's work in Jerusalem.[3] On the other hand, the Jews at Elephantine probably lagged behind the Jews of Jerusalem, and for this reason or for others,

---

1. If the textual type of the Samaritan Pentateuch is regarded as "late", this alone cannot invalidate the other evidence--it may be a matter of a "Vorlage" having been used which elsewhere appears late.

2. R.H. Pfeiffer, p.57.

3. R.H. Pfeiffer, pp.817-20, 825, cf. Batten, p.47, Eissfeldt, pp.751-53, Sellin-Rost, p.164, etc. contra Aalders, Kanoniek, pp.379-81, Van Selms, pp.18, 89-91 and especially H.H. Grosheide, pp.36-47.

already
this evidence does not compel us to change the conclusion reached).[1]

******

Having arrived at the period of Nehemiah's governorship, we have reached the late stages of the historical narratives of the Old Testament itself. It now remains to discuss the data from the Old Testament very briefly, without entering into too much detail, for example, concerning the dating of the various books of the Old Testament.

The author of Eccl. 12:12 seems to have known quite a number of books in his day, and from the context in which this is mentioned, it seems that he is referring to religious books. Yet this reference

---

1. It should also be borne in mind that practically all scholars agree that this law of Deuteronomy 12 had already been enforced from at least 621 B.C. (cf. note 2on p.120), therefore this divine law seems to have been broken in any case. There is a point that has, however, been overlooked, namely that according to this letter (lines 13-14) (cf. Van Selms, p.147) their temple was built before Cambyses came to Egypt (in 525 B.C.), and therefore before the temple in Jerusalem was rebuilt (520-515 B.C.). This means that this temple was most probably built while the one in Jerusalem lay in ruins, and therefore its erection need not have been regarded as conflicting with Deuteronomy 12 etc. Desiring to restore this temple, if for no other reason than that of convenience or sentiment, the people of Elephantine may have written this letter exactly because they feared violating the canonical Law. That the authorities in Jerusalem were reluctant to grant them this permission may be seen from the mention in the text (lines 17-20) that no reply was given from Jerusalem to a previous, similar request, written in 411 B.C. This probably indicates that at Jerusalem the Law of Deuteronomy was regarded as authoritative.

gives no positive data about the Canon.[1] More definite is the reference in Dan. 9:2 which proves that at that stage there were books, including Jeremiah, which were regarded as the word of God. This text, valuable as it seems at first sight for the history of the Canon, gives us no new information, because if the traditional date is assigned to this verse--the first year of Darius I (Dan, 9:1): 521 B.C.--it can only mean that some Scriptures, including Jeremiah, were than regarded as canonical, but it does not indicate their number and it cannot mean that the prophetic Canon was concluded, for at least Haggai and Zechariah only started their ministry in the following year (Hag. 1:1; Zech. 1:1). If, on the other hand, this verse dates from about 165 B.C., as is now generally thought, we have the older evidence of Ben-Sira to prove that the "Prophets" were regarded as canonical at this stage. From this text nothing can be deduced concerning the K^{e}tûbîm.[2] As a matter of fact, all scholars agree that in the Old Testament itself, there are no references to the canonicity of the K^{e}tûbîm as a group.[3]

---

1. Cf. Ryle, p.130, who dates this text in the third century B.C. Since no conclusions are drawn from this text, it is not necessary to determine whether this date is correct or not.

2. The Book of Daniel was itself included among the K^{e}tûbîm. For the whole discussion, cf. Aalders, Kanoniek, pp.56, 58, Keil, p.512, New Bible Handbook, p.30, who all emphasize this as being a reference to a group of Scriptures, though not clearly delimited, whereas H.W. Robinson, p.196 (cf. 127) and Ryle, p.122, regard it as an indication that the N^{e}bî'îm were considered canonical in 165 B.C. (cf. also Wildeboer, p.27, Kuhl, p.36, Dronkert, p.100).

3. Cf. Aalders, Bijbelsch Handboek, p.331.

What does become clear from the texts just mentioned and similar data, is the fact that collections of books were made and these were read and used before there was a general recognition of their canonical character.[1]

When we turn our attention to the prophetic books of the Old Testament, we notice that the prophets claimed divine inspiration for their words, as in I Kings 22:14-17; Is. 6:8ff; Jer. 1:9-10; Ezek. 2:3-3:27; Amos 3:7-8; 7:14-17; Micah 3:8 and in many other instances. Some of the prophets also relate that they received a divine command to write what they prophesied (Is. 8:1; 30:8; Jer. 30:2; 36:1-2, 17, 27-28, 32; Ezek. 43:10-11; Hab. 2:2). In this way the books of the prophets may be ascribed to divine revelation, which implies canonical status.[2] Proof that the divine character of the prophetic scriptures was accepted is the fact that later authors and prophets on various occasions quoted an older prophet, while there are also many allusions to older prophecies (Micah is quoted in Jer. 26:18; Jeremiah in Dan. 9:2; cf. also II Kings 17:3; Is. 34:16; Jer. 7:25; 28:8; Ezek. 38:17; Hos. 6:5; Zech. 1:4; 7:7, 12; Neh. 9:26, 30).[3]

---

1. Such collections are also to be found in Biblical books such as Psalms, Proverbs, cf. Aalders, Kanoniek, pp.59-60. Weiser, p.246, points out that reading of such books increased their authority.

2. Some of the pseudepigraphic books not included in the Hebrew Canon (Enoch, IV Ezra) also claim divine inspiration, but in these cases the claim was not recognized in the Synagogue (nor in the whole Church).

3. Ryle, pp.110-11, Wildeboer, pp.27, 29, cf. Aalders, Bijbelsch Handboek, p.331, Keil, pp.511-12, New Bible Handbook, p.28, Ridderbos, p.188, Weiser, p.248. For other important references to the prophets, cf. Aalders, Kanoniek, p.58 and Weiser, p.245.

There then came a time when the cessation of prophecy was envisaged (Zech. 13:2-5; cf. 1:5);[1] and when this actually happened the prophetic Canon was in fact closed, although it took some time before this fact was generally admitted and the Canon of the Prophets was finally recognized.

The prophets often refer to the Law or appeal to it, as for example in II Kings 17:13; Is. 8:20 (cf. 34:16); Hos. 8:12; Zech. 7:12; Mal. 3:22 (4:4 in translations)--demonstrating that the prophets and Law belong together, and that this Law is authoritative.[2] In the post-exilic period the Tôrâ was certainly regarded as authoritative, as may be seen from the emphasis of the Book of Malachi and the decisions reached in the time of Nehemiah (and the vocabulary of Neh. 9; while Neh. 13 especially demonstrates the fact that the Tôrâ prevented intercourse between the Jews and the Heathen.)[3] It is fairly certain that the Law which was read by Ezra according to Neh. 8 was thereafter

---

1. Mal. 3:23 (in translations 4:5) also indicates that prophecy will only reappear as a special event; cf. Ryle, p.111 (cf. 115-16 for the whole argument), New Bible Handbook, p.30, Kuhl, pp.35-36.

2. Aalders, Kanoniek, p.56 (who points out that according to Hos. 8:12 the Law was written), his Bijbelsch Handboek, p.330, Ryle, pp.89 and 105. (For Is. 34:16, cf. Dronkert, pp.100, 117 contra Wildeboer, p.23).

3. Compare Ryle, pp.82, 113-14.

regarded as authoritative, so that we may assign to the recognition of the Canon of the Tôrâ a date not later than 444 B.C.[1]

According to II Kings 22-23 "the book of the law" or "book of the covenant" was found in the temple in the days of Josiah (621 B.C.) and this inaugurated the religious reforms which Josiah brought about. This book was undoubtedly regarded as authoritative and as containing the word of Yahweh (II Kings 22:18-19), so that we can safely say that this event was a recognition of its canonical character.[2] The question,

---

1. Wildeboer, pp.27-29, Ryle, pp.79ff (who calls Ezra the promulgator of the Tôrâ), Weiser, p.247, cf. R.H. Pfeiffer, pp.56-57 (who, however, places the final "canonization" of the Tôrâ about 400 B.C.), New Bible Handbook, p.29 (who regards the book of the Law read by Ezra as the Tôrâ which had previously been regarded as Canon and was now emphasized anew), Kuhl, pp.32-34 (who agrees that this Law was previously known, but says its extent is uncertain), Ridderbos, pp.187-88 (who regards this Law as the entire Pentateuch), Driver, p.vi (who says this last-named view is possible); H.W. Robinson, pp.189-92 (who states that this is the Law Ezra brought with him from Babylon according to Ezra 7:14, 25, but thinks it did not comprize the entire Pentateuch). For the date of Ezra, cf. note 3 on p.115. If we accept the later date (cf. Robinson, p.189) then the final canonization falls around 400 B.C. One could, of course, argue that the reading of the law by Ezra does not constitute the canonization of the entire Tôrâ, but it does seem that what Ezra read was essentially the entire Tôrâ, and the development of Judaism on this basis indicates that its acceptance was virtually a "canonization".

2. R.H. Pfeiffer, p.52, H.W. Robinson, p.188, Ryle, pp.47-48, Wildeboer, p.22 (who all regard this as the very first recognition of a Canon of Scripture) cf. Kuhl, p.34 and Weiser, pp.247-48. "Canon" in this period need not be taken in exactly its present developed sense, but it would mean a book (or books) with divine authority. It would be interesting to develop this theme, using ancient codes with prologues invoking divine authority.

however, is whether this book was the entire Tôrâ, and to this question a negative answer is generally given, stating that this was only the Book of Deuteronomy.[1] There are, however, conservative scholars who disagree with this view because they regard the Pentateuch as more of a unity;[2] but in this present study, where we are trying to establish beyond all doubt what the minimum contents of the Canon were at a certain stage, we must admit that what is certain is that in 621 B.C. the Book of Deuteronomy (or the greater part of it) was recognized as canonical.

When we go back even further, we find various references to the "Law of Moses" in the books of the Old Testament dealing with the earlier history of Israel as Jos. 1:7-8; 8:31-32; 23:6; (24:26); Jud. 3:4; I Kings 2:3; II Kings 14:6//II Chr. 25:4; II Chr. 23:18 (also 17:9).[3] If we accept them as trustworthy witnesses to the events

---

1. Among many we refer only to R.H. Pfeiffer, p.52 and Ryle, pp. 49-54 who give various reasons for their opinion.

2. Compare, for example, New Bible Handbook, pp.147-48, cf. 115-23. On pp.28-29 (cf. Kuhl, p.32) it is further stated that II Kings 22 (cf. verse 11) refers to an old law that had been neglected and not to a new Law, contra R.H. Pfeiffer, p.52, Ryle, p.55 and others.

3. Cf. also Jos. 11:15; and 24:26 which may refer to an addition to the Mosaic Law (Aalders, Kanoniek, p.57, Keil, p.510, cf. Kuhl, p.32), although Ryle (p.41) regards it as one that did not survive; II Chr. 17:9 speaks of the Book of the Law of Yahweh; II Kings 14:6//II Chr. 25:4 quotes Deut. 24:16 as divine command; later references are II Kings 23:2-3, 21-25 and II Chr. 34:14, 30-31; 35:12 referring to Josiah's time; Ezra 3:2; 6:18 (cf. Dan. 9:11, 13); and Ezra 7:6; Neh. 8:1, 14 (8:2, 15 in translations) referring to Ezra's time and Neh. 13:1. Psalms may be a late source, cf, Wildeboer, p.24, contra Keil, p.511. For further discussion cf. Aalders, Kanoniek, pp.55-58 and 111, Dronkert, pp.98, 116-17, Keil, p.511, New Bible Handbook, p.511, R.H. Pfeiffer, p.52, Ridderbos, p.187. According to Deut. 17:9-12; 24:8 (cf. Micah 3:11; Hag. 2:11-12) the priests were required to give legal decisions based on the Law (cf. Ryle, p.32). What should be noted, too, is the fact that certain laws were placed in the Sanctuary:

they describe, then we may date the canonical authority of the Tôrâ as far back as the time of Moses himself. If, on the other hand we argue that these books reflect the views that were current when they were written, then the whole problem of the dating of the various books is raised.[1] At this stage it suffices to say that if the Mosaic authorship of the greater part of the Tôrâ is accepted,[2] then it is

---

Ex. 40:20, cf. 31:18; I Kings 8:9 and 11:12 mention the two stone tablets of "the Witness" (cf. Ryle, pp.41-46). Deut. 17:18; 31:24-26, cf. 4:2; 13:1 (12:32 in translations) mention the same fact regarding Deuteronomy, whose text should be protected from alteration (cf. Eissfeldt, p.759 and Keil, p.510); I Sam. 10:25 mentions the law pertaining to kings (cf. Kuhl, p.32, Ryle, p.41); II Kings 22:8 states that the law was taken from the sanctuary (cf. Keil, pp.510-11, who states that the Law was also available in copies). According to Ryle (p.42) and Wildeboer (pp.22, 24, cf. Keil, p.510) this does not mean that the Law was canonical; it could, for example, be completely forgotten.

1. It is not our intention to deal with these matters here; we would need especially to discuss the Books of Joshua and Kings (beside the works of the Chronicler).

2. This view is maintained by some conservative scholars. They refer especially to Ex. 24:3-7 which states that Moses wrote the Book of the Covenant (cf. Aalders, Kanoniek, pp.56-57, Dronkert, p.98, Ridderbos, p.187), while Deut. 31:9, 24 probably refers to a part of the Tôrâ as written down by Moses--Aalders, Kanoniek, p.57, Ryle, pp. 31-32; cf. Dronkert, p.38 (who thinks it may also be the Book of the Covenant, though this seems unlikely). Kuhl, p.32 and Ridderbos, p.187, both regard it as referring to a part of Deuteronomy. (Ex. 24:12; 31:18; 32:16 mentions God as Author of the commandments written on stone, given to Moses--cf. Weiser, p.245).

also natural to assign canonical authority to it immediately after its compilation, on the basis of texts like Jos. 1:7-8; 8:31-32; 23:6. On the other hand, if the Tôrâ is regarded as the product of a much later period, then it is natural to assume that the earlier references to the "Law" or the "Law of Moses", refer only to parts of the Pentateuch, for example the Book of the Covenant or Deuteronomy; or otherwise these references may be regarded as even later than the compilation of the Tôrâ.

It is therefore difficult to come to definite conclusions in the case of the data from the Old Testament. What may be said with certainty is that the Old Testament contains no clear references to the canonicity of the K^{e}tûbîm and N^{e}bî'îm as completed groups,[1] but it does justify the conclusion that the Tôrâ was acknowledged as Canon by 444 B.C. About the status of the Tôrâ before this date there is a difference of opinion.

---

1. In the case of the N^{e}bî'îm the approaching finalization of the prophetic Canon is indicated by certain texts like Zech. 13:2-5; cf. note 1 on p.119.

Chapter VI

THE "TÔRÂ" AND "N^{e}BÎ'ÎM" AT QUMRAN

As we turn our attention to the position of the Canon of Scripture as revealed in the manuscript finds at Qumran, it should be borne in mind that no dogmatic statements on the Canon have been found at Qumran, and there are no indications that these ever existed. A more indirect approach will have to be undertaken in order to try to determine what was regarded as the authoritative or inspired Word of God. To accomplish this, it will be necessary first of all to determine which books were read by the members of the sect, as evidenced by the copies that have been found. This alone however does not prove canonicity; therefore an investigation will have to be made into the quotations from Biblical books. Here the most important data will be direct citations where the name of the source is mentioned, followed by evident citations but without any indication of the source; then the allusions must be considered, and finally the possible references and reminiscences.[1] Apart from these data, attention should be

---

1. Compare the remarks and tables of Du Plessis, pp.39-46.